

JPRS-UKO-84-011

15 June 1984

# USSR Report

TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No. 5, March 1984



FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

#### NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

#### PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

15 June 1984

## USSR REPORT

### TRANSLATIONS FROM KOMMUNIST

No 5, March 1984

Translations from the Russian-language theoretical organ of the CPSU Central Committee published in Moscow (18 issues per year).

### CONTENTS

Not Only Obligation, But Also Patriotic Duty .....	1
Marx's Struggle Against Opportunism and for the Purity of Revolutionary Theory (A. Kosichev) .....	14
Responsibility in the System of Socialist Production Relations (B. Godunov) .....	25
Development of the Theory and Practice of Planned Price Setting (A. Matlin) .....	39
Economic Mechanism for the Formulation and Implementation of Intensive Plans by Collectives (P. Bunich) .....	52
Increasing Role of Workers in Developing Production and Management: Statements by Leningrad Brigade Leaders .....	66
Exploit Continued (V. Barayev) .....	78
Scientific Historicism and the Cooperation of the Arts (Vladimir Terent'yevich Pashuto) .....	94
Soviet Trade Unions in the Struggle for Peace (S. Shalayev) .....	107
Communists and the New Social Protest Movements (Yu. Krasin) .....	121

Departures and Blind Alleys of Bourgeois Political Economy (N. Yermoshkin) .....	134
Workplace System: Development Features (I. Malmygin) .....	144
U.S. Intelligentsia: History and Contemporaneity (N. Pokrovskiy) .....	151
Student Enrollment in Republic and Interoblast Higher Party Schools ...	154



PUBLICATION DATA

English title : TRANSLATION FROM KOMMUNIST, No 5  
March 1982

Russian title : KOMMUNIST

Author (s) :

Editor (s) : R. I. Kosolapov

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo "PRAVDA"

Place of Publication : Moscow

Date of Publication : March 1984

Signed to press : 21 Mar 84

Copies : 925,000

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda",  
"Kommunist", 1984

## NOT ONLY OBLIGATION, BUT ALSO PATRIOTIC DUTY

AU132000 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84)  
pp 3-13

[Text] The socialist state--that is us, the Soviet people; that is us, masters of the country. How efficient our national economy will be depends on the quality and quantity of our work. Our active, vital position and the extent of the realization of our duty as citizens are primarily manifested in work.

The fourth year of the 11th Five-Year Plan is in progress. The five-year plans are of great historical importance for the fate of socialism. The economic successes embodied by these periods have created the material and moral-political prerequisites for achieving a high level of welfare of the Soviet people and of the economic independence and successful defense of our fatherland. Today when imperialism has proclaimed a new "crusade" against communism and when the clouds of an American-type "new order" threaten to darken the sun of peace, it is necessary to mobilize the greatest reserves of the entire country in order to successfully fulfill the projected plans and ensure that more will be produced and better work will be done wherever possible.

The primary production force of society is man and the primary reserve of accelerated economic development is selfless labor which, in view of the relations developing in the world and in view of the intensified aggressiveness of imperialism, not only has a civic significance but also assumes an increasingly greater patriotic importance: battle and labor medals are cast from the same metal. It is precisely for this reason that the socialist competition for high production indices has developed on such a large scale in the labor collectives.

The third year, that is, the middle year of the 11th Five-Year Plan period was characterized by labor enthusiasm. The plans of the current, the fourth year are full of daring projects whose fulfillment demands intensive work and accuracy, rhythm and good coordination.

What has marked the past year of development of the national economy? The activity of the party in strengthening state, labor and planning discipline and the measures on strengthening the economy which won the support and approval of all working people, who accepted them as their very own vital concern, have produced an obvious positive result. In 1983 the national income

used for consumption and accumulation increased by 3.1 percent as compared with 1982; the total volume of industrial production increased by 4 percent as compared to its increase of 2.9 percent in 1982; and in this connection the production of the "A" industrial group increased by 3.9 percent and that of the "B" industrial group by 4.3 percent. The main index of the efficiency of production also improved; last year labor productivity increased by 3.5 percent. The basis of this growth was provided by the introduction of new and progressive technical equipment and technology, the production commissioning of 3,700 new types of machines and equipment, tools and materials, the introduction of a number of highly efficient technological processes and the greater use of microprocessors and technical robotics equipment.

Overcoming considerable difficulties, the agricultural workers increased production by 5 percent, or by a value of 6.4 billion rubles. The deliveries of grain, sugar beets, tea leaves, cattle and poultry, milk, eggs and a number of other products increased compared with 1982.

In the past year, substantial measures were implemented to further raise the level of welfare of the people. The average monthly work pay of workers and employees in cash increased by 2.4 percent and the work remuneration of kol-khoz members increased by 7 percent.

The economy produced everything needed to maintain the motherland's defense capability at the proper level.

The positive changes in the national economy are evident. This was also noted at the December 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee which discussed the progress of the implementation of decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and of the November 1982 Plenum of the Central Committee as well as questions concerning the projects of the State Plan of Social and Economic Development of the USSR and the USSR state budget for 1984.

The 1984 State Plan of Economic and Social Development of the USSR, which was discussed by the plenum and examined and adopted by the Ninth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 10th convocation, sets new important goals of construction of the mature socialist society. In this year it is planned to increase the national income used for consumption and accumulation by 3.1 percent. And in this connection the entire increase in the national income will be directed toward raising the standard of living of the people.

The output of industrial products will have to be increased by 3.8 percent and the volume of agricultural production by 5 percent. It will be possible to achieve this only by further improving the efficiency of the economy. Its main index, labor productivity, must increase by 3.4 percent of industry, 3.3 percent in construction and 8.5 percent in agriculture (in the social sector). The increase in labor productivity will account for 97 percent of the total increase of the national income, 90 percent of the increase of industrial production and the entire increase in agriculture and railway transport.

The plan devotes great attention to the fuel and energy complex. This complex will be developing in light of the tasks outlined by the USSR Energy Program. In 1984, the output of electric power will reach a total of 1,465 billion kilowatt hours, i.e., it will increase by 3.6 percent by the end of the year. In this connection, the output of electric power by nuclear and hydroelectric power plants will increase by approximately 12 percent in the same period. The production of crude oil and condensed gas will amount to a total of 624 million tons, marking an increase of 7.7 million tons over the production of last year, and the production of 578 billion cubic meters of gas is planned, that is, 42.5 billion cubic meters more than in 1983.

The current year must represent an important step in the implementation of the USSR Food Program. Gross agricultural production is planned to total 140.4 billion rubles, that is, 8.4 billion rubles more than last year. Deliveries of grain, raw cotton, potatoes, vegetables, melons, tobacco, tea leaves, silk cocoons, eggs and pond fish are planned to be at the level of the five-year plan or a little higher. The deliveries of cattle and poultry are set at a higher level than in 1983, but nevertheless a little below the tasks of the five-year plan for 1984.

The dynamic development of the economy, the constant growth of the efficiency and the fulfillment of the adopted production plans will make it possible to implement a wide range of measures aimed at raising the standard of living. Per capita real income will increase by 3.5 percent as compared with the increase of 2 percent in 1983 and with the increase of 3.1 percent envisaged for 1984 by the five-year plan. The average monthly salary of workers and employees will increase to 185.5 rubles or by 2.2 percent, and the average monthly work remuneration of kolkhoz members will be 142.2 rubles, marking an increase of 3 percent.

Just as in past years, the volume of housing construction and of the construction of other nonproduction projects will also be large. Social consumption funds will amount to a total of 139.5 billion rubles, an increase of 3.7 percent as compared with 1983. The planned annual increase of the commodity trade by 16.5 billion rubles, or 5.4 percent, will ensure a greater balance between the incomes and expenditures of people.

Further measures will be taken to protect nature and ensure a more rational utilization of natural resources. The state's capital investments for this purpose will amount to 2 billion rubles.

The plans are far-reaching. A great amount of difficult and intensive work will be required to fulfill them.

It is important to organize this work precisely, both centrally and in the field, in every enterprise, every kolkhoz or sovkhoz and every building site and to ensure an efficient utilization of the enormous production potential that is available in our country, an acceleration of the scientific-technical and the introduction of advanced technologies. The ways of achieving this were analyzed by the December 1983 and February 1984 plenums of the CPSU Central Committee. A thorough analysis of the urgent tasks of our national



economy was made by Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his speech at the meeting with the voters of the capital's Kuybyshevskiy Electoral District.

A resolute and businesslike attitude toward fulfilling the intensive 1984 plan requires complete clarity in every labor collective about the ways, methods and means by which the final results determined by the plan's tasks will be achieved. What was calculated and determined in the course of the plan's preparation must be fully realized in the course of the plan's implementation. And what is more, it is necessary constantly to seek additional reserves whose utilization will further increase production.

"According to the party spirit," it was noted at the December 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, "the task can only be set this way: It is necessary to ensure an unconditional fulfillment of the plan and utilize in this connection all possibilities for its overfulfillment. All economic activities, socialist competitions and the economic, organizational and ideological political work of party, trade union and Komsomol organs and local soviets must be directed to this goal."

The decisions of the December Plenum of the Central Committee and the call to increase the labor productivity and reduce production costs in excess of the plan have deeply animated the Soviet people. Moscow workers have been among those who were the first to respond to the set task with work. In their socialist obligations for 1984, they have envisaged an increase of labor productivity in industry, construction and transport by 1 percent and a reduction in production costs by 0.5 percent in excess of the adopted plan and, as a result of this, they will prefulfill their annual tasks under the plan. The industrial workers will achieve the entire increase in the volume of production by achieving the projected labor-intensiveness and increased labor productivity; profits in excess of plans will amount to 80 million rubles. The transport workers, builders, the collectives of the city economic enterprises and organizations and of academic and branch institutes, higher education institutes and planning and design bureaus and trade, public catering and everyday service and repair workers have also set concrete goals. All labor collectives will strive for an efficient and economical utilization of raw materials and of material and energy resources. Moscow workers will increase their contribution to implementing the Food Program. The working people of other cities, entire republics and industrial and agricultural enterprises have also adopted their obligations.

The Law on Labor Collectives and the resolutions to strengthen discipline and develop the brigade form of organization of labor, which were adopted in 1983, were aimed at developing the creative activeness of the masses. The growth of initiative of the working people, which is characteristic of the present time, testifies to the vital force of these documents. The duty of the economic leaders and of the social organizations is to mobilize people to achieve high final results, by relying on the energy of the masses and taking direction from party decisions.

The concrete task of increasing labor productivity this year by 1 percent over and above the plan and of reducing prime production costs by 0.5 percent

in addition to the plan has become a universally recognized scale for evaluating the degree to which production reserves are being utilized. However, it must also be borne in mind in this respect that formalism and a hackneyed attitude in determining the prospects of growth are inadmissible.

Taking on enhanced obligations must proceed from a realistic assessment of resources and potentials. The loopholes for manipulating the indices for the sake of coming up with the necessary figure must be really tightly closed. It is good that the collective of the Kostomuksha ore-dressing combine, one of the country's largest iron ore enterprises, has decided to increase labor productivity this year by 1.2 percent. These enterprises create reserves for maneuvering within the branch--they make it possible to strictly realistically take the potential of each labor collective into account and to ensure the unconditional fulfillment of the national economy's additional task of increasing labor productivity and reducing prime costs.

Concrete and scrupulous consideration of every way of increasing labor productivity opens up new prospects. The general course in this matter is that of utilizing new and more efficient machines, equipment, and technology. This requires the investment of considerable state resources and the introduction of a multitude of scientific and technical achievements in production operations. The most important directions here are broadly utilizing data processing means, computer technology and automation; modernizing many types of technology so as to produce more perfect products; expanding the production and utilization of new types of raw materials--plastics and compound materials, ceramics, glass fiber, amorphous metal alloys, and also biologically active medicinal and alimentary synthetic substances and substances obtained by microbiological and genetic engineering methods; and broadly developing material- and energy-saving types of technology by utilizing secondary energy sources and heat, and also material waste products, which cost the country two to four times less than newly obtained materials.

However, it must be borne in mind that automation does not yet mean an automatic reduction in labor consumption. For this effect to be achieved, the introduction of the achievements of the scientific-technical revolution in production must be harmoniously combined with the implementation of the scientific organization of labor. As was noted at the December Central Committee Plenum, the Dnepropetrovsk Combine Plant imeni K. Ye. Voroshilov has done exactly this by introducing the practice of certifying work places. This valuable measure was implemented at the initiative of the workers at the plant. The initiative shown has signified a way out of the circle of the set obligations and has required looking at one's task from the point of view of social duty. Everything possible has been done to increase production efficiency. And this has immediately expanded the horizon for search and made it possible to find a way to the desired aim. Operating under a "duty mandate," the collective has coped with the task set by time--it has found a considerable amount of labor resources at its plan without any particular major expenditure.

This kind of approach to the matter is exceptionally significant. Now practically the whole of the able-bodied population is employed in useful work. Consequently, it is no simple task for the available and constantly

increasing production and scientific-technical potential to begin to be completely effective and produce high returns. This task cannot be fulfilled if the projected production potentials are amended to the level of those which actually exist. In addition, idle production potential has a negative effect upon labor discipline, contributes to cadre turnover and consequently also to a reduction, however temporary, of the average worker qualification, prevents the growth of labor productivity and of the quality of production, and acts as a stimulus for raising pay too high.

The ways of overcoming this situation are well-known. Primarily, they are introducing strict order and raising the level of organization in enterprises. Practicing the complex certification of workplaces, combining professions, expanding the service zones, and advancing multimachine operators are well-known and tested methods. And today it is important as never before to use them.

On the other hand, the reconstruction and technical modernization of the production operations which are carried out on a higher scientific-technical level, and which make it possible to reduce the quantity of the necessary manpower, are particularly urgent in the existing situation. Consequently, the task of accelerating scientific-technical progress requires constant and persistent attention to literally every little cell of our production organism.

In this connection, an important role is played by the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers "On Measures for Accelerating Scientific-Technical Progress in the National Economy," adopted in August 1983, which resolved the ripe problems of organizing, directing and stimulating this process.

Thus, the necessary conditions already exist. In Leningrad, where measures to enhance the role of the workers in design, technological and project organizations in the introduction of advanced experience and the latest scientific studies in production are being tested in practice, the first positive results have already been achieved. The duty of workers and employees, and of scientists and engineering-technical workers in scientific research, design, planning and design and technological organizations, associations and enterprises is to do everything necessary for the successful fulfillment of the tasks set by the party which are of paramount importance in this sphere.

Capital construction occupies one of the central places in our plans for socioeconomic development. It is no longer unusual to hear our country called a gigantic building site. And it is understandable--the scale of capital construction in our country is vast; it embraces both industrial and agricultural production and the whole complex of living and cultural and everyday service conditions.

The role and scale of this branch of the national economy also explain the level of demands made upon it. Unfortunately, as was noted at the December CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the state of affairs here, as before, cannot satisfy us.



A powerful industrial construction base exists in our country, there are skilled planning and design organizations and the building sites have better technical equipment than before. There is both skill and positive experience in construction--the recent commissioning of the Urengoy-Pomary-Uzhgorod export gas pipeline and the construction of the Baykal-Amur Mainline, which is successfully nearing its conclusion, eloquently testify to this. But, at the same time, there are fundamental shortcomings in construction activities --for example, the vast counter-transportations of ferroconcrete manufactured products, which uneconomically burden the railway transportation system and which are caused to a considerable extent by a departmental approach to forming and utilizing a construction base. Or the flagrant violations of state discipline in the designing, building, and exploitation of projects in Volgodonsk, in connection with which the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has adopted a special resolution.

What is seen as the first step to overcoming these shortcomings? "The key to success here, though, as everywhere, lies in increasing the responsibility of the cadres," it was noted at the December 1983 Central Committee Plenum, "and in being highly exacting toward them regarding the irreproachable fulfillment of their obligations, accuracy and initiative, and the unconditional fulfillment of standing tasks." A sense of party and civic duty lies at the basis of all measures aimed at improving the state of affairs. But it is important not to overlook something else. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko noted, "matters" must "be arranged in such a way that the initiative and creativity of the broadest working masses are revealed in all their fruitfulness and force."

The resolution of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers on observing contractual obligations in delivering products was an important step in the matter of strengthening discipline and a sense of responsibility in the relations between enterprises. It provided the planning organs with grounds for intensifying the struggle to introduce order and increase responsibility in ensuring the smooth running of the enterprises and in not tolerating holdups and failures in deliveries.

However, the so-called "maximum percent of underfulfillment" of delivery plans by 1 to 2 and, in exceptional cases, of 3 percent, which has been established as a result of those reasonable considerations that, in its huge complexity, the national economy must inevitably suffer incidental, and precisely incidental, rare failures which need not cancel out all the positive results of work, has been taken in some places as a particular right to underfulfill plans within the indicated limits, while retaining the right to the corresponding bonuses. The exception has become the rule for a number of machine-building ministries, for example, which have set a maximum permitted percent of underfulfillment of contractual obligations for almost half their enterprises.

It is clear that the corresponding instructions were not perfect. But something else is also obvious. A developed sense of responsibility, an awareness of one's duty to one's partners and an understanding of one's role not only as a worker, but also as master in a developed socialist society must be an insuperable barrier to such phenomena.

No less a role is played by a sense of responsibility, trust, and obligation in the development of the brigade form of labor organization, too. It is difficult to imagine the brigade contract developing successfully if order in material supplies and work assignments is not observed, if the principles of the economic accountability system are violated and if a clear and intelligible link between the work input and pay is not established.

Great and responsible is the role of transportation, the economy's circulatory system. All of its sectors are faced with great and difficult tasks this year. But it must be rendered its due--positive trends have appeared in this sphere, although there are still many reserves and unutilized potentials. After the November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, at which the work of railway transportation was subjected to severe criticism, the Ministry of Railways drew the most serious conclusions: Particular attention was paid to fundamentally perfecting the style and methods of work, to improving the organization of operations, and to changing the psychological attitude of the cadres. This work was aimed at increasing responsibility in all the units of the branch. Exactingness toward the leaders, specialists, and all the railway workers regarding the fulfillment of transportation plans for all categories of freight was intensified, and decisive measures to strengthen plan, technological and labor discipline were adopted. Serious measures were implemented to improve the selection, training and distribution of the cadres, and attempts to justify errors and failures in work were decisively put to an end. And the result was quick to take effect: The plan for dispatching freight in 1983 was prefulfilled. In comparison to 1982, freight turnover increased by 3.9 percent, passenger turnover by 1.5 percent and labor productivity by 3.9 percent.

Prime transportation costs were reduced by 1.5 percent over the plan, and a profit of more than 440 million was obtained over and above the plan.

There are many reserves in freight transportation, and these reserves are being energetically exploited. But the implementation of serious changes has not yet been managed in the sphere of organization of passenger transportation.

The 1984 plan envisages an increase of 1.8 percent in labor productivity in railway transportation; another 1 percent will be ensured above the plan. This above-plan growth will make it possible to transport additionally more than 30 million metric tons of freight of the national economy with the same resources and to carry out additional work amounting to a total of 30 billion metric ton-kilometers. Reducing prime transportation costs in 1984 by an additional 0.5 percent will make it possible to reduce expenditures by approximately 70 million rubles. In the final analysis, it is planned to reach the goal of 4 billion metric tons of dispatched freight by the end of the current five-year plan. This will virtually completely satisfy the transportation requirements of the national economy. And as far as labor productivity is concerned, it is planned to move to the most advanced positions in the world during the next few years.

How is it planned to achieve this growth? Mainly by perfecting the technology of transportation organization which introduces computer technology to utilize economic-mathematical methods of optimum planning and management.

Another important reserve which is being utilized and will be utilized even more extensively is that of driving heavy load and long freight and passenger trains. This year the railway system will drive super-heavy load trains of 10,000 to 15,000 metric tons.

Realizing how important it is for the country that the work of the railways be improved, a number of industrial enterprises of the Moscow network proposed carrying out current repairs on railway car bodies and containers using their own forces. The initiative was highly appraised by the CPSU Central Committee. Broadly introducing the initiative thus made it possible to return more than 720,000 cars and approximately 220,000 containers to the line in 1983. Here is a worthy example of the working people giving mutual assistance and showing a sense of responsibility for the state of affairs not only in their own enterprise and their own department, but also in the whole of our national economy.

Common interest! This kind of approach to the matter should have been taken long ago to overcome departmental disconnection which leads to excessively large and inefficient operations in carrying out and in planning deliveries of timber loads, ferroconcrete manufactured products, sand, road metal, gravel and bricks. Our society expects the industrial and construction ministries and departments and the planning and supply organs to fulfill this task.

Motor vehicles road transportation is playing an increasingly great role in the country's transportation services. And although the transportation costs of economic organizations are increasing, enterprises are prepared to pay even more to ensure motor vehicle transportation services for themselves. Unfortunately, together with the growing costs, the write-ups [pripiska] are also growing and they are considered by some as an insurmountable evil. According to this, the arrangement is such that, despite the general state interests, the write-ups are convenient for many. They make it easier for a motor vehicle transport enterprise to "fulfill" its plan and do not burden excessively its partners because the imposition of fines merely results in transferring the figures in the state bank from one paper to another, not in the least affecting the concrete interests of anyone. It appears that this bureaucratic "logic" loses sight of the main thing, the sense of responsibility of every participant in production relations before the society for the final result of his activity. Covering up the direct damage caused to the people by invoking the shortcomings of economic mechanisms is intolerable. Otherwise it would be possible to shield the driver who sells left and right the gasoline "economized" as a result of write-ups, by claiming, if you please, that speculations bring him a higher income than bonus payments for economizing fuel.

It is an indisputable fact that the economic mechanism must be further developed and perfected, but this fact cannot justify the real and deliberate

damage to our national economy by those who have found shelter in its cracks while its failings and imperfections have not yet been overcome.

Positive changes in agriculture, and especially in livestock breeding, were noted at the December 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. The purchases of milk, cattle, poultry and eggs increased. The next step must now be made in increasing the production of fields and farms. Ensuring an efficient utilization of the available production potential in agriculture and solving the problem of food supply for the population--this is the most important obligation of the party and soviet organs.

And there is no need to try to prove that the results of economic operations depend to the greatest extent on the organization of work in the agricultural enterprises and on the attitude of those directly responsible toward their work. A creative approach, responsible fulfillment of one's obligations, and developed sense of duty make it possible to advance under the most diverse conditions. What is important is to be able to determine one's own path in fulfilling the common tasks. It is well-known that developing construction in rural areas is a complex task. But, for instance, the Omsk Oblast has found the key to this task which made it possible to overfulfill the state capital construction tasks in the 10th and 3 years of the 11th Five Year Plans. In the current five-year plan, capital investments in agricultural construction exceeded by 7 percent the average capital investments in the first 3 years of the preceding five-year plan period. Particularly great attention was devoted to village social development. About 1 billion rubles were allotted by the state and by kolkhozes for this purpose, and the average yearly capital investments for this purpose in the 11th Five-Year Plan exceeded the average yearly investments in the 10th Five-Year Plan by 40 percent. Positive changes are also taking place in production itself. In the 3 years of the current five-year plan period, the proportion of the hard and strong wheat varieties in the total volume of wheat production increased from 75 to 91 percent. In 1983, the oblast's kolkhozes and sovkhoses ended their year with a total profit of 55.5 million as compared to the total loss of 84.5 million in 1982. The proportion of the losing farms was reduced by nearly one-half.

The inability to see the main thing in the organization of production often leads to extreme deviations in technology and to fruitless abstract discussions about the advantages and shortcomings of large complexes or of small farms in livestock and breeding. But what has determined the success in the development of the livestock breeding complex of the Ruchi Sovkhoz's Lavrika farm, located near Leningrad? It was first and foremost the liquidation of the former lack of personal responsibility for work and the creation of a situation in which the full responsibility for one's sector of work was ensured on the basis of the organization of a collective brigade contract. The work of every individual is evaluated strictly on the basis of his work contribution and in this connection all the problems connected with this are settled publicly at monthly general meetings.

Technology is not introduced by itself, it is said at the farm. The most important element in this connection is to supply the complex with sufficient



fodder. And if the obligations are precisely determined and if people are interested in the final results, thanks to the brigade contract, then it will also "turn out" that a current crop rotation will be organized in the fields, that a sufficient supply of organic fertilizers will be ensured, and that the necessary supply of fodder will be obtained.

In 1983, the correctly applied technology enabled the complex to ensure a milk yield of 4,766 kilograms of milk per cow and to plan a milk yield of 4,800 kilograms for 1984. The work of milking machine operators (milkmaids at the old farm) at the complex is difficult: Today each operator is assigned to milk 150 cows, three times as many as in the past. But when order reigns in work, people do not leave the farm although the remarkable city of Leningrad is nearby and attractive.

The improvement in the well-being of the Soviet people and the population's constantly increasing income set production the urgent task of fully supplying the market with the necessary commodities in view of the continuous growth in demand for their variety and quality. Demand is very different today from what it was a few years ago. Today the main problem is not whether a commodity exists at all (there are sufficient supplies of many groups), but rather it is a question of the quality of the commodity in all its manifestations (durability, reliability, fashionability and so forth). Greater flexibility of production and trade is required under these conditions to satisfy contemporary demands for consumer goods. The real needs of the population must be studied thoroughly, the current state of the market followed, and industry reorganized in time so that manufactured goods for which there is no demand, but on which good quality raw materials and skilled labor have been expended, do not sit in the warehouses. In this matter, as in the other spheres of our economy, the personal responsibility of the leaders and of all those whom the state has assigned the task of directing this most important sector of work is of paramount significance. The party soviet and economic organs must exert constant control over the ways in which the problem of filling the distribution channels with the necessary commodities and of liquidating the shortages in some manufactured goods or services or other is resolved.

Having the cardinal fulfillment of all these tasks in mind, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has recognized the necessity of drawing up a complex program for developing the production of consumer goods and the system of consumer services within the framework of Main Directions of the USSR's Economic and Social Development for the 1986-1990 Period and for the long-term period.

Work to raise the level of leadership of the economy is an important strategic task, the fulfillment of which must be activated. "The party also sets the problem in all its acuteness," Comrade K. U. Chernenko points out, "of broadly developing the perfection of management of the economy and the reorganization of the economic mechanism." We are engaged in work in this direction, and a considerable amount of work too: The quality of state plans has improved. Nevertheless, certain ripe tasks have not yet been fulfilled--for example, tasks such as selecting the most effective variation of development and the main section to determine an intensive path of growth for the economy in a concrete situation. The economic mechanism needs to be well-oiled so as to be able to fully utilize the advantages characteristic of the

socialist economy, while placing public interests above everything else in this respect.

In this connection the economic experiment to broaden the rights of the production associations (enterprises) and to increase their responsibility for the results of work, which is being conducted in a number of ministries, is of great significance. Its aim is to heighten the interest of the collectives in working out and fulfilling intensive plans and in making fuller use of production reserves. Search for and introduction of what is new should not be limited to the enterprise included in the experiment.

"Showing more independence at all levels, boldly searching, and taking, if necessary, justified risks for the sake of increasing the effectiveness of the economy and of improving the people's well-being--this is what we expect of our economic cadres," state Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

The most important task of the work remuneration system consists in stimulating the growth of labor productivity. This reflects the objective need for a growth of labor productivity head of the growth of pay. This need must be concretely embodied in economic practice. It is appropriate at this point to recall the precise and very true words of Yu. V. Andropov: "Marx's fundamental idea that to speed up the progress of productive forces there must be the corresponding forms of organization of economic life, can be repeated again and again, but the matter will make no headway until this theoretical truth is translated into the concrete language of practice." With regard to maintaining the correlation between the growth rates of labor productivity and of pay, such a "translation" has not been fully implemented with the economic mechanism.

In order to correct the matter, measures are being taken which envisage increasing the dependence of the amount of resources available for wages upon the final results of production and the increase in its efficiency. Thus, the norm of correlation between the growth of labor productivity and of pay has been established in industry in the plan for 1984. An even more developed system has been envisaged under the conditions of the economic experiment. Here, on the one hand, a growth in wages is possible only with a simultaneous greater growth in the volume of production, labor productivity, and other economic indices, and, on the other, the rights of the enterprise to utilize what has been saved on wage resources under these conditions are broadened.

Steadfastly implementing the socialist principle of remuneration according to work is one of the main concerns of the socialist society. Whoever does more work and works better must also receive more and live better. And, of course, the situation must be directly opposite for anyone who works poorly. Herein lies the social justice on which the Soviet system is based.

The optimization of the system of management based on the principle of democratic centralism represents a component part of the efforts to perfect developed socialism. It was noted at the December 1983 Plenum of the Central

Committee that the "question of working out a complex program of perfecting the entire system of management is ripe" and that this program must fully reflect the level of maturity of our society and correspond to the nature of the tasks at hand.

Such a program would envisage both putting in order the organizational structure of management at all levels and further improving the system of national economic planning and increasing the effectiveness of all economic levers and stimuli used in our country.

The question of responsibility for concrete results at every workplace and at all levels of leadership was at the center of attention of the December 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and its analysis of the problems of socioeconomic development and the ways of overcoming the existing difficulties. The idea of conscientious and qualitative fulfillment of his production obligations by every worker regardless by his workplace permeated the statement of Comrade K. U. Chernenko at the February 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee as well as his speech to voters.

The analysis of the contemporary world situation and the importance of increasing the strength and might of the Soviet state in the existing situation provided grounds for the December 1983 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee to note that, "under the conditions of a sharply exacerbated international situation through the fault of the aggressive imperialist circles, a strict fulfillment of the state plan is not only an obligation, but the patriotic duty of every Soviet citizen, every labor collective and every party and social organization."

The decisions of the December and February plenums have been received with enthusiasm by our party and by all Soviet people. Serious and principled discussions are being held in party organization about the ways of implementing these decisions, about the concrete measures which must be taken, and about the ways of improving all our work. Communists everywhere express their firm confidence in successfully fulfilling the tasks set by the 26th Party Congress and the subsequent plenums of the CPSU Central Committee.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo Tsk KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/11



## MARX'S STRUGGLE AGAINST OPPORTUNISM AND FOR THE PURITY OF REVOLUTIONARY THEORY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 14-23

[Article by Prof A. Kosichev, doctor of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The creative development of the revolutionary theory of the working class, created by K. Marx and F. Engels, took place in the course of a sharp and uncompromising struggle against bourgeois ideology, opportunism and reformism. It was necessary not only to defend but to safeguard the purity of the great revolutionary doctrine.

Marx considered the ideological struggle waged by the proletariat as important as the economic and political struggle. By protecting the young labor movement from the nefarious influence of alien class views, Marx exposed the reactionary nature and antiscientific character of bourgeois philosophy, sociology, political economy, jurisprudence, ethics and aesthetics. The outstanding works of scientific communism he wrote are to this day the sharpest ideological weapons in the struggle against various forms of bourgeois ideology, opportunism and revisionism. Marx's entire theoretical legacy is an alloy of profound creative elaboration of the vital problems of social development, the liberation struggle of the working people and critique of antiscientific bourgeois and reformist concepts.

Marx's doctrine, which accurately reflects the objective laws of the socio-historical process, has won brilliant victories in the various continents of our planet. The bourgeoisie and its ideologues, aware of their helplessness and inability to defeat this doctrine in open struggle, are trying to undermine it from within. This is the purpose, in particular, of the opportunistic agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement and the proletarian parties. "The dialectics of history is such," V. I. Lenin wrote, "that the theoretical victory of Marxism forces its enemies to present themselves as Marxists. The internally rotten liberalism will try to revive itself in the guise of socialist opportunism" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 23, p 3).

The struggle which Marx waged against the opportunistic epidemic is of truly permanent significance. He defined the characteristic features of opportunism and reformism within the labor movement: rejection of a socialist revolution and seizure of political power by the working class, preaching the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism and rejection of the need for a

revolutionary party of the proletariat as its leading organized detachment. In their efforts to "update" Marxism and thus to deprive it of its revolutionary nature, the contemporary opportunists and revisionists formulate, although somewhat changed but essentially the same, ideas and arguments which were used in their time by their predecessors and which were debunked by Marx.

1

The contemporary bourgeois ideologues, "Marxologists," opportunists and revisionists, who present their wishes as reality, claim that Marxism is in a state of "crisis." Even the increased interest shown by millions of people throughout the world in Marx's doctrine is caused, in their view, allegedly by its condition of crisis and aspiration to repair its theoretical excesses and gaps. Paradoxical though it might seem, this is also occasionally believed by leftist writers and even those who call themselves Marxists.

Thus, in the article "Marx and Engels on the State," published in the book "Politics, Ideology and the State" (London, 1978), the scientific value of Marx's theory of the base and the superstructure and, particularly, the state, is questioned. The British social sciences yearbook ("Socialist Register," London, 1979) claims that the "crisis in Marxism is the result of the fact that Marx failed to elaborate in full the theory of the state" (p 105).

What could be more absurd than such claims? It is precisely the problems of the state on which bourgeois philosophers, economists and historians and, after them, opportunists of all hues, have shamelessly speculated, that have been always the focal point of Marx's struggle against alien theories. The historical credit for creating a truly scientific theory of the state goes precisely to Marx. The accuracy of this theory was confirmed during the 20th century in the course of the victorious socialist revolution in Europe, Asia and Latin America.

The great founder of scientific communism directed the entire power of his scientific and critical talent and temperament of revolutionary fighter against bourgeois and opportunistic concepts which idealized the exploiting state, pitting against them the truly scientific definition of the state as an instrument of class domination.

Contemporary "Marxologists" and various types of "renovators" and critics of Marxism also blame Marx for considering the bourgeois state only as an instrument of coercion and for paying no attention and even ignoring the ability to reconcile and to achieve through its policy an agreement among classes, allegedly inherent in a bourgeois democratic state, and for his alleged inability, as a result of such an approach, to create a "positive theory of democracy." Unfortunately, such views penetrate among communists as well.

In decisively fighting bourgeois and opportunistic ideas on the exploiting state as an instrument of "order" and "agreement," Marx always formulated entirely clearly and definitely the question: In whose interest is this

order and what is the purpose for this so-called "agreement?" He also provided the only accurate answer: this order is subordinate to the task of preserving the existing exploiting system and preserving the private ownership of productive capital. The bourgeois state neither does nor can recognize anything else.

Marx attacked with all his power the opportunistic leaders of the German social democrats who, as they revered the bourgeois state, categorily rejected the need for its overthrow. The philistines called for strengthening and preserving the bourgeois state. In exposing opportunistic fabrications, Marx and Engels wrote in their preface to the German edition of the "Communist Party Manifesto" (1872) the following: The Paris Commune proved in practical terms that the working class cannot simply take over an existing state machinery. It must break it down and wreck it.

Naturally, Marx acknowledged the relative independence of the state. He did not consider the superstructure, the most important part of which is the state, a simple automatic reflex of the economic base. The state has its own specific laws of evolution and logic of dynamics which do not directly stem from the economy. It is only in the final account that the economy determines the laws of its development.

The founders of scientific communism also defined and substantiated the active role of the superstructure, including that of the state. If the state and politics are powerless, they argued with the so-called "economic materialists," why then are we struggling for the creation and strengthening of a revolutionary political party of the proletariat, for the seizure of the political power by it and for setting up a state of the working class? The efforts of the contemporary critics of Marxism to depict matters as though Marx rejected the active role of politics and the state on the basis of the fact that he derived their appearance and development from the economic base are structured on direct falsifications and forgeries and concealing "unsuitable" statements and even entire works by Marx and Engels.

Today's "Marxologists" blame Marx for not separating the concept of the bourgeois state as representing the interests of exploiting classes from the concept of the state as an instrument of administration. They thus try to conceal the obvious fact that both during Marx's time and today the bourgeois state is ruled by the stooges of the capitalists, who promote and defend their interests. Marx's merit is that he substantiated the unbreakable tie between the class-exploiting functions of the bourgeois state, on the one hand, and its administrative functions, on the other.

As to the problem of so-called "agreement," Marx favored an agreement between the broad exploited and toiling masses, who were fighting the exploiting classes, and the representative of the interests of the latter--the bourgeois state.

The opportunists were decisively rebuffed in his work "Critique of the Gotha Program," which proves the inevitability of the transitional period from capitalism to socialism and the need for a revolutionary dictatorship of the working class.

Marx condemned the primitive-vulgar interpretation of the revolutionary socialist dictatorship of the proletariat by the supporters of "barracks communism." The working class is the bearer of the new, the communist production method, by virtue of which it naturally acts as the leading force in society. Unlike the exploiting classes, however, it is the true representative of basic interests of all working people and the bearer of powerful social progress. To Marx the dictatorship of the proletariat meant socialist democracy, freedom for all working people and protection of their interests. The entire history of the 20th century and all proletarian victories and defeats confirm the accuracy of Marx's views on the state and the treasonable nature of opportunistic myths according to which the bourgeois state is an instrument of "order" and "agreement" among classes.

2

The opportunistic elements became particularly energetic within the German social democratic movement during the second half of the 19th century. Lenin noted that for a long period of time Marx and Engels "systematically and steadily struggled against opportunism within the German social democratic party and persecuted the intellectual philistines and petit bourgeois in socialism" (op. cit., vol 15, p 242).

During the first decades of the existence of the German social democratic party, Lassallianism presented a particular threat to the workers movement in the country. Lassalle, who rejected the socialist revolution and the class struggle of the proletariat, preached a peaceful path to socialism through universal elections and the creation, with the help of the bourgeois state, of labor production associations. Lassalle's doctrine became the ideological foundation for an opportunistic movement which developed within the German social democratic party in the 1870s. Marx subjected to profound scientific criticism Lassallianism as an ideology alien and hostile to the interests of the working class. In criticizing Wilhelm Liebknecht for his reconciliation with the Lassallians, he wrote: "Liebknecht has indeed made a grave error with his deal with the Lassallians, widely opening the gates to such halfway people and unwittingly preparing demoralization within the party..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 34, p 327).\*

Bernstein, Schramm and Hoehberg, the opportunists within the German Social Democratic Party, preached a long evolutionary development and rejected the need for revolution. Their views were presented in ZUKUNFT, JAHRBUCH and other journals.

Marx sharply criticized the opportunistic supporters of the peaceful growth of capitalism into socialism. The opportunistic credo "Retrospective Survey of the Socialist Movement in Germany," drafted by Hoehberg, Bernstein and Schramm, rejected the struggle for the final objective and openly proclaimed the need for petty reforms within the framework of capitalism as a means for the social liberation of the working people. While acknowledging in words

---

\* Further references to the works of Marx and Engels will be indicated with volume and page only.



the possibility of "achieving" socialism, they considered it a matter of the distant future. In exposing such typically opportunistic subterfuges aimed at misleading the working people and dulling their revolutionary vigilance, Marx and Engels described the demagoguery of the opportunists as follows: "The program should not be abandoned; however, its implementation should be postponed...for an indefinite period. It is accepted but, actually, not for themselves, not for the sake of following it in the course of their lifetime, but for the sake of bequeathing it to their children and grandchildren. Meanwhile, "all efforts and all energy" are directed toward all kinds of trifles and a pitiful darning of the capitalist system..." (ibid., p 319).

As Marx proved, all opportunistic demagoguery is aimed at deceiving the workers. While not rejecting in words the class struggle of the proletariat, the opportunists are doing everything possible to suppress it in fact. They consider the "overthrow of the capitalist system a matter of the distant future which is of absolutely no importance in terms of contemporary political practice; that is why they may act as intermediaries and engage in accommodations and philanthropy as much as they wish. Such is precisely the case with the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. On paper this struggle is recognized, for to deny it is already simply impossible. In fact, it is being suppressed, glossed over and weakened" (ibid., p 320). The opportunists consider as their main task the prevention of a major socialist revolution and to preserve and save the bourgeois society. They called upon the Social Democratic Party to direct all its forces and energy "for the implementation of petit bourgeois reforms which would strengthen the old social system and thus perhaps prevent the final catastrophe through a gradual, partial and, if possible, peaceful process of degeneration" (ibid.).

The opportunists and revisionists of the end of the 19th and the 20th century have remained loyal to this bourgeois "credo" so clearly described by Marx.

The leaders of the right wing of the German Social Democratic Party replaced the revolutionary class struggle of the proletariat with reformist activities in the bourgeois parliament. The outcome of their parliamentarianism, Marx pointed out in his letter to Sorge, dated 19 September 1879, may be seen from the fact that they consider a crime the criticism of their opportunistic speeches on the grounds that "a handful of parliamentary party representatives" had given them the right to speak thusly. "More is the shame of this handful!" Marx said indignantly. "...They have become contaminated by parliamentary idiocy to such an extent that they already consider themselves above criticism..." (ibid., p 328).

Marx firmly criticized the opportunists' rejection of the universal historical mission of the working class. The proletariat, lacking the necessary education and culture, is unable to achieve a "social liberation," they claimed, for which reason it must be guided by the educated representatives of the rich classes until the workers learn how to manage the state through the parliament. In mocking such reactionary opportunistic views, Marx and Engels wrote the following: "Briefly: The working class is unable to achieve its liberation with its own hands. To achieve this it must obey the

leadership of the 'educated and rich' bourgeois, for they alone 'have the time and opportunity' to find out what could be useful to the workers" (ibid., p 317).

Today's bourgeois philosophers and sociologists, reformists and revisionists, who deny the universal-historical nature of the proletariat, tirelessly claim its alleged disappearance and dissolution within a certain middle class. They try to prove that the contemporary working class has merged within the capitalist system, has become "bourgeoisified," for which reason it is no longer able decisively to overthrow it, for it is no longer a revolutionary force. Arguments with which to substantiate this reactionary concept are being drawn from the antiscientific understanding of the contemporary scientific and technical revolution.

Marx and Engels did not pit the molding of a revolutionary consciousness in the working class against scientific and technical progress. Precisely the opposite, they believed that scientific and technical progress, the growth of industry and changes in production methods will objectively require a suitable literacy and culture of the workers and a deeper understanding of political life, thus contributing to the growth of the revolutionary awareness of the working people and turning them into a powerful sociopolitical force capable of destroying capitalism.

The opportunists tried to focus their main strike against the proletarian party, to subordinate it to the interests of the bourgeoisie and to deprive it of its proletarian class nature. "...In the opinion of these gentlemen," Marx and Engels wrote, "the Social Democratic Party should be not a one-sided worker party but a many-sided party of all those inspired by true love of man." In order to prove this, it must first of all abandon its gross proletarian passions.... The Social Democratic Party must not be the party of the working class. It must not draw upon itself the hatred of the bourgeoisie or, in general, anyone's hatred. It must above all engage in energetic propaganda among the bourgeoisie...." (Ibid., pp 317, 320). Marx and Engels firmly separated themselves from the opportunistic leaders who rejected the theory of scientific communism. "As far as we are concerned, consistent with our entire past, we have one path only. For nearly 40 years we have promoted the class struggle as the direct motive force of history and particularly the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat as a powerful lever for a modern social change; therefore, we cannot at all go along with people who are trying to delete this class struggle from the movement.... We cannot, consequently, go along with people who openly proclaim that workers are too uneducated to liberate themselves and therefore must be liberated from above, by philanthropic upper and petty bourgeoisie (ibid., p 322). Marx and Engels called for a decisive struggle against the opportunists. They called for expelling from the party those who had drafted the opportunistic "Retrospective Survey." "What kind of party could tolerate in its ranks the authors of such an article is entirely puzzling to us. If such people would assume the leadership of the party to one extent or another, the party would simply become castrated and would no longer have any proletarian energy" (ibid.). To Marx the opportunists "are wretched counterrevolutionary chatterboxes" (ibid, p 326).

Left-wing petit bourgeois adventurism against which Marx fought stubbornly and irreconcilably for a long time is no less dangerous to the cause of socialism and the worker movement.

Marx criticized opportunism "from the left," which was represented by Most and his newspaper FREIHEIT. He exposed the sterility of petit bourgeois pseudorevolutionism. "We do not blame Most," he wrote, "for the fact that FREIHEIT is excessively revolutionary. We accuse FREIHEIT of the fact that it has no revolutionary content whatsoever but merely revolutionary phraseology" (ibid., p 325). In proving Most's entire inconsistency and oscillation from one extreme to another, Marx emphasized that "he is just like a weather-vane, which turns one way or another at the slightest change in the wind" (ibid.).

The bearers of petit bourgeois "leftist"-opportunistic revolutionism were, above all, the anarchists who were able to become part of the international association of workers. According to Engels, they tried to act as representatives of the extreme "left-wing" "revolutionary" trend and to impose a petit bourgeois ideology to the worker movement. They tried to discredit the theory of scientific communism. They accused Marxism of "nonrevolutionism." Zealously camouflaging themselves behind pseudosocialist phraseology and presenting their pitiful eclectic mixture as the last word of "social science," the bearers of petit bourgeois revolutionism had a corrupting influence on the international labor movement.

The anarchists formulated the "super-revolutionary" "left-wing" opportunistic concept of social change within the society and for the liberation of the working people: immediate and total economic change, destruction of the state and establishment of full social equality. The working class, the working people, they claimed, should formulate only the type of tasks and undertake only the type of actions which would lead to the immediate overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the full victory of the working people. They considered bourgeois any form of struggle waged by the working class the task of which was not the immediate destruction of capitalism.

Marx proved that such ideologies and tactics hostile to the proletariat are reduced to fatalism and quietism, to the passive expectation to the great days but with an inability to rally and gather the strength needed for the great events under preparation. This is a justification of inaction, of passiveness and of abandonment of the revolutionary struggle. In his article "Political Indifference" Marx pointed out that according to the quasirevolutionary anarchist appeals, "the workers should cross their arms on their chest and not waste their time taking part in the political and economic movement. Such activities could yield only immediate results. As true believers, they should exclaim, scorning their daily needs, 'let our class be crucified, let our tribe perish, but let the eternal principles remain pure!'" (vol 18, p 297).

Marx also taught that making a socialist revolution requires the creation of the necessary objective and subjective conditions. This requires, above all,



a political party of the proletariat, armed with a scientific revolutionary theory, the organization and upbringing of the working class, the development of its political, economic and ideological struggle and work in the mass organizations of working people.

Essentially the contemporary "leftist" opportunists reject the need to train the masses for revolution. Displaying their sectarian limitations, they underestimate progressive democratic reforms and ignore broad popular movements and nonparty associations of the masses.

Marx ascribed tremendous importance to the struggle for democracy in the liberation movement of the working class. The supporters of petit bourgeois revolutionism--the anarchists--conversely claimed that the struggle for democracy would draw the people's masses away from the main objective--the immediate advent of "total communism"--and would have nothing in common with the liberation of the working people from the yoke of capitalism.

Today's "leftist" opportunists, who follow the anarchists, reject the role and significance of the struggle for democracy in the preparations for and making of the socialist revolution. Unlike the "leftist" sectarians, Marx considered democratic order and political freedoms most important conditions for the development of the class struggle and for taking it to its logical end--the establishment of a people's regime.

In the course of the struggle against petit bourgeois anarchic revolutionism, Marx profoundly resolved the problem of compromises. The anarchists categorically rejected compromise, considering it a deal with the bourgeois system and a profanation of "eternal principles." Unlike them, Marx considered compromising possible and acceptable, for it leads to the implementation of the main tasks and objectives of the proletarian movement--the victory of the socialist revolution and the seizure of political power by the proletariat. It contributes to the organization and upbringing of the working class and to the latter's realization of its universal historical mission.

In preaching immediate "social revolution"--the overthrow of the bourgeois system--the anarchists demanded the destruction of anything which was born and grew up on capitalist soil, such as large-scale production, progressive science and culture, so that "no stone remained unturned of them." In their manifestos and appeals they wrote that "we must not teach but promote rebellion among the people.... He who learns revolution from books will always remain a revolutionary idler."

In mocking the representatives of petit bourgeois revolutionism, Marx and Engels wrote: "Here comes revolutionary revolutionism!" (ibid., p 338).

Marx and Engels attacked most devastatingly "barracks communism," preached by "leftist" adventurists who claimed that in the society of the future all people will mandatorily have to be members of communist associations. In the opposite case they would have no right of access to public cafeterias or hotels; in a word, those who do not join such cooperatives without legitimate reasons would be deprived of means of existence.

In debunking this malicious caricature of socialism, Marx and Engels wrote: "What a splendid model of barracks communism! It has everything: common cafeterias and dormitories, tally men and offices regulating education, production and consumption and, in a word, all social activities..." (ibid., p 414). Unlike this, the Marxist classics emphasized that communism ensures the comprehensive development of the individual and the fullest possible satisfaction of the material and spiritual needs of the people. In this connection they sharply criticized the petit bourgeois catechism of the anarchists who demanded that the association-communes "produce for society as much as possible and consume as little as possible" (see ibid.).

In the struggle against right-wing and "left-wing" opportunists, Marx and Engels created a militant proletarian party step by step. They firmly opposed sectarianism in the labor movement and the factions in the First International. They sharply criticized the divisive Alliance for Socialist Democracy, with the help of which Bakunin tried to subordinate the First International to his "autocratic management." The sectarian and anarchic Alliance aimed "its blows not at existing governments but at revolutionaries who rejected its dogmas and leadership" (ibid., p 329).

4

Marx waged an irreconcilable struggle against philosophical revisionism. He criticized the narrow ethical substantiation of socialism. The opportunists considered socialism not the legitimate result of socioeconomic progress, determined by the effect of objective laws, but as a subjective ideal created by the human mind, a manifestation of "justice," "goodness" and "intelligence," and as the aspiration of the people for "universal happiness." This makes the philosophical base of socialism not materialism but subjective idealism. The contemporary social reformists are trying to resurrect the same ideas in an updated form. Thus, in his work "Social Democracy at the Crossroads," J. Ray proclaims "social justice," "solidarity" and other abstract concepts as the main principles of "democratic socialism." In criticizing the program of the opportunist, according to which socialism is based on the concept of "justice," Engels wrote that "from the very beginning such a program would exclude anyone who would consider socialism, in the final account, not as the consequence of ideas or principles such as justice and so on, but as an ideal product of the material-economic process and the public production process on a given level" (vol 34, p 296).

The bourgeois "Marxologists" are trying to prove that in the final years of their lives Marx and Engels had abandoned the idea of revolution, became supporters of evolutionary development and applied the laws of nature to social life. Thus, in the book "Who Should Change Everything," J. Huber claims that "Marx and Engels considered human history above all as natural history and then the history of the species." O. Ulrich, another representative of ecosocialism, considers in his work "The Global Level: The Dead End of Industrialism," the absence of research on the inner nature of man and suggests that "this sociopsychological gap in Marxism be filled with Freudian psychoanalysis." The only possible purpose of such a misleading approach is to hinder the communist reorganization of the world. If insurmountable

natural laws exist in society, there is no need to organize and educate the working class and to create its political party. Since nature develops through evolution, society as well should develop not through revolution but through evolution. It is as though said authors failed to notice the fact that Marx was a firm opponent of the biologizing of social processes and the identification of the laws of nature with those of society.

The modern philosophical revisionists reject the laws of dialectical materialism formulated by the Marxist classics and substitute "philosophical anthropology--the theory of man in general--for dialectical materialism although, as we know, philosophical anthropology does not exist anywhere. They are unwilling to accept that without the acknowledgment of universal dialectical laws we cannot resolve the problem of man and understand his social nature. Yet without a knowledge of this nature we cannot realize the meaning of the individual human existence and define the content of specific human activities. The rejection of the universal laws governing the development of the objective world and thinking, studied in dialectical and historical materialism, blocks the way to the solution of all philosophical and social problems, including the humanistic ones, for the universal laws are a methodological foundation without which scientific studies are inconceivable. In this matter the contemporary philosophical revisionists and the "renovators" of Marxism are not original. They cleverly borrow anticommunist arguments. An opponent of Marxism such as Y. Bochensky also claimed in his work "Soviet-Russian Dialectical Materialism" that Marx allegedly did not support the philosophy of dialectical materialism. He criticizes Lenin for "blending the doctrine of Marx and Engels within a single entity." The anticommunist Sidney Hook proclaimed Marx's "second coming" not as a supporter of dialectical materialism but as a harbinger of "philosophical anthropology." However, in exposing such attempts at distorting Marxism, at the turn of century Lenin wrote that "none of these individuals can be ignorant of the fact that Marx and Engels described their philosophical views as dialectical materialism dozens of times" (op. cit., vol 18, p 9).

In reality, the basic laws of dialectical materialism and its concepts and categories were formulated by Marx and Engels together. In this case Marx's "Das Kapital" played a tremendous role. On the basis of this immortal work, in his "Anti-Dühring," Engels systematically presented the foundations of Marxist philosophy. That is why he could say with full justification that "...most of the outlook depicted in this book was substantiated and developed by Marx and only a very small amount by myself. To us it was self-evident that my work could not be published without his knowledge. I read my entire manuscript to him before signing it to press..." (vol 20, p 9).

In depicting Marx as the father of "philosophical anthropology," the contemporary critics of dialectical and historical materialism claim that their task is to restore the true, the "authentic" Marxist philosophy, allegedly formulated in Marx's early works. Naturally, they ignore the crushing criticism of petit bourgeois "true socialism" and Stierner's anarchism, which the founders of scientific communism made in their book "The Holy Family" (1845) and in "German Ideology" (1846) at the very dawn of the labor movement. Well, such "forgetfulness" is not astounding, for idealism and metaphysics,

these doctrines debunked by Marx, are no less typical of contemporary philosophical revisionism. The common nature not only of the methodological and class positions but even the arguments and means of polemics used by today's revisionists and "true socialists," on the one hand, and Stierner and Prudhon, on the other, are so striking that Marx's criticism of his opponents in the 1840s sounds like angry charges leveled at the contemporary revisionist "innovators."

Let us cite one example. Using the ideological baggage of Prudhon, an opponent of the revolutionary struggle and strikes which allegedly harm production, W. Rogers, a noted leader of the Labor Party in Great Britain, writes in his book "The Policy of Change" that "strikes or other attempts at disturbing the law threaten democracy and industry." In criticizing Prudhon's views, Marx claimed that "strikes have always served as grounds for the invention and application of one new machine or another.... Even if mechanical inventions would have been the only result of coalitions and strikes, in this case again coalitions and strikes would have had a tremendous impact on industrial development" (vol 4, p 179).

Marx's irreconcilable position concerning bourgeois ideology and the various forms of unscientific socialism in the period when Marxist philosophy was being formed shows the total groundlessness of bourgeois "Marxology," opportunism and revisionism which tried to depict the young Marx as a "peaceful" philosopher-reformer, a preacher of Feuerbachian morality of universal love for mankind, allegedly rejecting the revolutionary methods of struggle. In fact, an inseparable unity, an inner logical connection exist between the early and the mature works of the founders of Marxism. In his later works Marx developed and concretized the ideas contained in his early ones.

Marx's heroic and truly tireless struggle against opportunism on the scale of the labor movement as a whole as well as within the individual social democratic parties is an immortal exploit in the name of the cause of the working class and the progress of all mankind. The theoretical concepts developed by Marx and his fellow workers in the course of criticizing the ideology of opportunism and reformism, formulated by the great founders of scientific communism, are an inexhaustible source from which the communist and worker parties and the revolutionaries of all countries draw ideas on the ways and methods for the revolutionary change of the world.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11



## RESPONSIBILITY IN THE SYSTEM OF SOCIALIST PRODUCTION RELATIONS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 24-35

[Article by B. Godunov, candidate of economic sciences, and M. Skarzhinskiy, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] Under contemporary conditions the increased responsibility of the workers at each job and in all units within the single national economic complex in the country has become a necessary prerequisite for upgrading social production efficiency and accelerating the pace of economic and social development. The 26th CPSU Congress indicated that "under contemporary conditions the importance of discipline and of personal responsibility increases a great deal." The November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum particularly emphasized the requirement of "increasing responsibility for the observance of the interests of the state, of the whole people." Understandably, the solution of these problems is based on a profoundly scientific approach which presumes an understanding of the nature of socialist relations of responsibility and the forms of its manifestations and development trends. The level of maturity of socialist production relations and the contemporary opportunities provided by the science of economics enable us to study more fully the content of relations of responsibility in socialist social production and the forms of manifestation of such relations at various levels of the economic system with its respective means and methods of improvement. The intensive type of social reproduction inherent in developed socialist society turns such theoretical problems into vital requirements in economic management practice.

The problems of responsibility are comprehensive and complex. They are found at the intersections of a number of sciences and demand a comprehensive solution. Extension literature exists on problems of cost accounting, legal, administrative, moral and educational influence on responsibility. Legal acts and administrative regulations are state forms and methods of influencing the behavior of workers and collectives, the purpose of which is to intensify and improve relations of responsibility in the socialist reproduction process--if developed as phenomena of a purely superstructural nature, without proper consideration of various essential features in the structure of such relations could hardly ensure the necessary efficiency and development of the entire wealth of their socialist spectrum.

Today both theoretically and practically the need has developed for a more profound approach to such problems. It is important for the regulating

influence on responsibility relations to penetrate deep within socialist production relations and affect the economic foundation, of which the various forms of responsibility on the surface of economic life and in the super-structural strata are the external manifestation.

The problem of the more effective and reliable regulation of responsibility relations may be resolved on the basis of the determination of their profound economic nature.

Concepts of responsibility in the national economy as a subject of strictly administrative and juridical origin and ascribing responsibility relations most frequently to the system of superstructural relations are quite popular. The main role in strengthening responsibility relations here appears to be that of the corresponding legal acts and specific incentive systems. However, practical experience proves that despite the entire need for material incentive measures and for legal support of responsibility, by themselves they are insufficient in developing the entire wealth of the economic content of socialist responsibility relations. Responsibility as a feature of direct social production is more profound and historically more promising than commodity-value and cost accounting forms despite the entire significance of the latter under contemporary socialist economic management conditions.

In order to determine the economic nature of responsibility relations we must address ourselves to the level of production relations at which changes in production forces are directly made. Despite the entire specifics of economic forms inherent in capitalism, as K. Marx proved, they conceal something related to production in general and labor cooperation as such. "... If we eliminate the specifically capitalist nature of wages, added value, necessary labor and added labor, it is not these forms which will remain but merely their foundations which are common to all social production methods" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 25, part II, p 448). It is precisely these common foundations that are the material bearers of the economic forms specific to the given production method: consumer value to value; added product to added value; and the labor process as a process of interaction between people and nature to the production of added value.

In terms of responsibility, each specific production method also has a common material carrier, the nature of which is related to labor cooperation as such. Regardless of its socially defined form, labor cooperation always creates the objective needs for discipline and overall management and competition among workers. These three features of labor cooperation assume essentially new features under socialist conditions, radically different from those under capitalism. However, this does not eliminate the very fact that they are based on the joint participation of many people in the same labor process.

In our view, grounds exist for considering responsibility as the fourth feature of all labor cooperation, alongside discipline, management and competition. Any joint labor performed by a number of people, whatever its social form, is impossible without relations of reciprocal responsibility among workers although, naturally, the socioeconomic content of such relations is

given by the method of appropriation of the public product and the historically determined forms of ownership of productive capital.

However, does the entire content expressed in the concept of responsibility not include another feature of cooperation such as, for example, labor discipline? Does labor discipline not include an organic responsibility for maintaining it? Indeed, labor discipline and responsibility (like management and competition) are closely connected. They are genetically homogeneous but not identical. This becomes immediately visible when we undertake their quantitative definition and measurement.

Responsibility has its special measure which is objectively determined by the characteristics of the specific type of work and the specific job. The various types of specific work differ in terms of their responsibility which, in any case, depends on a number of basic factors. Above all, responsibility for a given type of labor depends on the significance of the specific labor operation or of the intermediary product which is manufactured in terms of end production results. Some labor operations on which end results depend to a greater extent than on others require increased responsibility. Areas of increased labor responsibility may be singled out in the manufacturing of any type of product and within each technological process. The measure of responsibility is determined also by the social significance of the product itself and the nature of the social need it must satisfy. It also depends on technical facilities and the amount of materials embodied in labor tools: increased scale of losses from idling and breakdown of equipment as it becomes more complex and the growth of the technical-labor ratio. The measure of responsibility also depends on the time spent on a labor operation, the size of which is determined by the objective need to observe the accepted technology and to maintain a socially normal labor intensiveness on all levels of the production process.

Therefore, at each job the measure of labor responsibility is objectively based on the specific characteristics of production forces (their overall mass, condition, method of operation, means of combining production facilities within a single system, etc.). It does not depend on who will perform a specific job and on the nature of his attitude toward labor and the other workers. Essentially, the measure of labor responsibility may be determined even before labor begins to act as functioning manpower, while the production process is still in the planning stage. In this sense, labor responsibility acts as an aspect of functioning production forces and is the bearer of socially defined forms of the responsibility of the worker and of responsibility relations.

Let us note two other important circumstances. What proceeds from the nature of labor cooperation is that the parameters and criteria of the efficiency with which the overall worker functions play a determining part in perfecting the process of the joint work of individuals. That is why the responsibility for joint toil is primary in terms of the responsibility for each of its specific types which, in turn, depend on the former in terms of content and measure.



Furthermore, as a product and feature of labor cooperation, responsibility is characterized directly through social ties and relations, for it is within labor cooperation that direct social relations among workers always develop.

Under the conditions of the social ownership of productive capital, applying the features of labor cooperation on a national scale also means extending the already noted features of responsibility on the same scale. The parameters of the overall social worker become the determining features of the responsibility of the individual worker and their direct social nature becomes the primary characteristic of responsibility relations.

Socialist cooperation of labor, the nature and scale of which are determined by the social ownership of productive capital, covers the entire national economic complex of the country. On the social scale it unites the co-owners of public production for the purpose of planned organized collective work. It determines, on the basis of unity and common economic interests, relations of comradeship, cooperation and mutual assistance among workers. The direct social ties and relations inherent in the nature of labor cooperation in general are extended under socialist conditions to all public production. Naturally, this also predetermines the volume of the economic content of the responsibility of the workers and the socioeconomic nature of responsibility relations. Such relations are characterized by features determined by the public ownership of productive capital, labor free of exploitation, the status of the individual worker as the collective co-owner of public production and its product, common basic economic interests, and subordination of the production process to the supreme objective of increasing the people's well-being and ensuring the comprehensive development of the personality of the member of the socialist society. Since production socialization on the scale of the national economy is primary and dominating in terms of the relative economic autonomy of socialist enterprises, to begin with the economic content of responsibility of the individual worker or of the overall enterprise worker is determined by the content of responsibility of the overall social worker for the efficient functioning of the socialist economy at large; secondly, the direct social forms of relations of responsibility both among workers and between workers and society are primary and dominant in terms of commodity-monetary and cost-accounting forms and influence the historical trend of development of the latter.

Under socialism the system of responsibility relations includes a complex sum total of direct and indirect economic relations and dependencies on the various levels of the production process: worker-society; worker-worker; worker-collective; collective-collective; collective-society; and so on. The responsibility relations imbue the entire structure of socialist production relations and are manifested in all of its strata.

In this case responsibility acts as a specific form of ties among the subjects of such relations. That is why the structure of responsibility relations is not a simple addition to the structure of socialist production relations but is modified by the system of economic relations, reflecting their objective trend in the overall social labor and in all stages of the reproduction process.

Such ties develop both vertically and horizontally. Vertical ties within the system of socialist production relations are consistent with the forms of ownership which develop among the units of the single national economic complex on various levels of national economic management. Horizontal ties within the system of production relations are consistent with the forms of responsibility of the units within the national economic complex located on the same level of the social production structure. Both vertical and horizontal economic ties must ensure that the economic activities of a given structural unit are consistent with the general economic target function and the national state economic interests: the increased output of the public product on the basis of the acceleration of scientific and technical progress and the primarily intensive factors (reduced labor-, material- and capital-intensiveness of output).

Therefore, the determining position within the structure of responsibility relations is that of its types and forms which directly reflect the social nature of socialist production and the primacy of the national economic interests compared to the interests of the individual unit or structural subdivision. If such a determining position is not fully consistent with national economic practices, such a deviation from objective requirements within the structure of responsibility relations triggers elements of departmentalism vertically and parochialism horizontally. In other words, the phenomena of departmentalism and parochialism themselves are the result of insufficient control of responsibility relations within the structure of socialist production relations.

On each specific structural level responsibility relations acquire characteristic features. The higher the level of the unit within the structure of the national economy, the more direct becomes the link between responsibility relations and the target function of socialist production and the supreme objective of the party's economic policy. Thus, the ministries are directly responsible to society not simply for the fulfillment of the plans but for the full satisfaction of the needs of society for specific commodities.

In the case of the enterprises and, consequently, the labor collectives, responsibility relations are transformed through state planned assignments. Their strict implementation in full and for all parameters is the main feature in the characteristics of the responsibility of cost accounting units. The trend of these relations is determined by responsibility for ensuring optimal national economic results within each link of the chain of inter-related enterprises and the end result. In this case, the responsibility for the economic and efficient utilization of resources and for implementing a regimen of savings is added to the responsibility for the implementation of the plan. Secondly, to the extent to which the need of society for a specific commodity can be directly assumed by enterprises, the responsibility for satisfying such requirements directly to society is retained by the individual enterprises as well.

Finally, within the enterprise or association relations of responsibility are determined by the requirements of intraproduction labor cooperation and the role of each subunit in achieving end production results. The responsibility

of the worker for normed assignments and quality of the work, oriented toward the end results of the entire collective, is shaped at the individual workplace.

Responsibility under socialism, if we consider its overall implementation, objectively exists and develops in two forms. In the realm of direct social relations it is the basic and determining direct responsibility of the worker as the co-owner of production capital and the public product, answerable directly to society as a whole.

This is a form of manifestation and development of responsibility consistent with the most profound, the essential feature of the system of socialist production relations--relations within society as the overall producer and directly between the individual producers (the workers) and society at large. In the area of commodity-monetary relations the responsibility of the workers goes through indirect forms consistent with shallower structural levels of the system of socialist production relations--relations among individual production cells (enterprises) and society at large, relations among production cells and relations within production cells.

The first reflects the direct tie between responsibility relations and the economic status of the worker as the co-owner of national productive capital. It is precisely this which determines the essential content of such relations: relations of responsibility between workers and society for the sake of ensuring the efficient functioning of the socialist economy. Lenin's requirement "that the conscientious worker feel himself not only the master of his plant but the representative of the country and that he feel the responsibility" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, pp 369-370) expresses the idea of the indivisibility of the direct interconnection between social responsibility and the economic status of the worker as the co-owner of socialist production and the development of direct social relations of responsibility as the worker develops a feeling of ownership and of representing the country. This determines the formulation of the question of the need to look for ways and means for the development of socialist responsibility relations consistent with the direct social form of their manifestation, such as to make every worker feel himself the owner of socialist production and responsible for its end results.

However, having formulated the question thusly, we immediately come across a very noticeable contradiction. When the question of nonvalue methods for increasing worker responsibility, based on the objective development of the worker under socialism as the owner of public production, is raised in scientific publications and economic practice, matters are usually reduced to measures of educational and legal order and to the utilization of superstructural influence. Unquestionably, these are necessary and important measures. No less necessary, however, are the nonvalue methods which do not go beyond the base. A responsible economic behavior by the workers cannot be achieved and direct social responsibility relations cannot be regulated exclusively through measures of legal and educational influence. However, nor could material influence through the "ruble" shape the co-owner of public production as representative of the country responsible for its economic strength and well-being.



The commodity-monetary form of worker ownership presumes the assessment of these relations among the participants in the production process on the basis of specific economic tasks and targets facing them (implementation of planned assignments, economical utilization of material resources, increased labor productivity, improved production quality, meeting deadlines for commodity procurements and in terms of variety, and so on), with the help of value indicators. In this case the labor collective plays an important role in directing the worker toward general economic social targets through the mechanism of socialist economic management. A special economic mechanism operates which coordinates the individual interests of the various groups of workers through the economic interests of labor collectives with the national interests. This is one of the important circumstances which enhances the role of labor collectives in developing relations of responsibility among workers and contributes to improving socialist relations of responsibility among collectives. The efficiency of this factor will be improved by the USSR Law on Labor Collectives and Their Increased Role in the Management of Enterprises, Establishments and Organizations, the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers and AUCCTU decree "On Intensifying the Work on Strengthening Socialist Labor Discipline," the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree "On Additional Measures To Expand the Rights of Production Associations (Enterprises) in Industry in Planning and Economic Activities and Intensifying the Responsibility for Work Results" and the CPSU Central Committee decree "On the Further Development and Improving the Efficiency of the Brigade Form of Labor Organization and Incentive in Industry."

The development of relations of responsibility in a commodity-monetary form is regulated with the help of cost accounting methods: the use of specific penalties against workers and collectives who violate established economic management forms, compensation for the damages caused by participants in the production process who have caused losses to their partners, granting benefits and material incentives for responsible behavior and so on. Such ways and means are being steadily improved and a search is under way for more precise indicators with which to assess the economic activity of enterprises and the labor contribution of the workers.

However, the commodity-monetary and cost-accounting forms of responsibility may be overemphasized along with the role of the stipulated methods in the development of the entire system of socialist responsibility relations. The point is that most frequently losses suffered by a participant in the production process are compensated for only partially, for which reason rekindling the interest of the victims is always illusory. There can be no question of observing national interests or compensating for losses caused to society by guilty participants in the production process, for society was short-changed and it is impossible to compensate for the missing goods. The development of responsibility relations in their commodity-monetary form is essentially a development of socialist responsibility relations and occurs only when losses are excluded in the course of the social production process caused by the nonresponsible (or irresponsible) behavior of any one of its participants and when said ways and means are focused on and develop relations of responsibility in a direct social form.



This becomes clear if we consider the dialectics of the direct social, commodity-monetary and cost-accounting forms of development of socialist responsibility relations and the correlation among means and methods for the development of such relations. Cost accounting responsibility is a method for achieving dialectical unity opposites directly through the social and commodity-monetary forms of responsibility. This reflects the internal structure of cost accounting as an economic category.

Since the direct social responsibility of the worker is of determining importance in this dialectical unity under socialism, the historical line of development of said contradictory unity makes direct social responsibility a form suitable to the general communist nature of socialist production relations. Consequently, it should be deliberately provided with a broader scope for its development. The way to resolve this contradiction is found not in its elimination or the elimination of any one of its aspects but in the reciprocal development of both sides through corresponding means and methods, while ensuring the objectively necessary combination between them. This means that all steps taken to develop commodity-monetary forms of worker responsibility mandatorily ensure the development of responsibility relations in their direct social form and must be deliberately aimed at achieving this.

A proper direction in the development of responsibility relations in their commodity-monetary form and the accurate determination and application of corresponding ways and means of influence can be secured only on the basis of the faster development within this dialectical unity of the direct social responsibility of the workers. In turn, this will require the search for and use of ways and means for their conscious advancement, consistent with the direct social form of responsibility relations.

The observance of such conditions for improving responsibility relations in their cost accounting form is assisted by the development of the sum total of socialist responsibility relations.

If we consider the system of socialist production relations as a whole, it becomes clear that the direct social responsibility of the worker is of a more profound nature than cost accounting responsibility. In order to develop the direct social nature of socialist responsibility relations we must apply suitable ways and means of influence, means which will influence the entire structure of socialist production relations and reach its deepest level where the direct social nature of responsibility is no longer concealed by superficial manifestations.

The November 1982 CPSU Central Committee Plenum pointed out the vital need for this kind of approach. It emphasized the need to set up the type of economic and organizational conditions which would objectively stimulate quality productive labor, initiative and enterprise. Having found the way for deliberately influencing the entire structure of socialist production relations, society acquires the possibility of promoting the responsibility of the individual worker under production conditions and within the collective where his responsible economic behavior by itself becomes an objective necessity. The totality of such measures could be described as the process

of ensuring the objective nature of worker responsibility and responsibility relations.

The progressive methods for production organization and labor, which have become widespread over the past decade, include elements of objectivized responsibility relations. The Saratov system for fault-free manufacturing and claim-free delivery of commodities contained significant elements of the objectivized responsibility for work quality. The experience of the Dinamo Plant in Moscow in the formulation of individual and five-year plans for increasing labor productivity on the basis of the comprehensive use of job reserves, the worker movement "Worker Guarantee for a Quality Five-Year Plan," initiated at the Moscow Plant imeni Vladimir Il'ich, the initiative of the ZIL Production Association "Engineering Support for Worker Initiative," the comprehensive quality control management systems, the "Worker Relay Race" competition among related enterprises and other progressive initiatives launched by production collectives mandatorily contain to one extent or another processes for the implementation of responsibility relations.

The study of forms of progressive experience indicates that each new one among them is born in accordance with achievements made at other enterprises. Relations of responsibility have become an objective requirement affecting an increasing number of workers. Direct responsibility relations have spread among increasingly broader groups of workers.

In the worker movement "Worker Guarantee for a Quality Five-Year Plan" at the Plant imeni Vladimir Il'ich, the comprehensive brigade plans based on the individual plans of the workers stipulated not only individual efficient and high quality work but also mutual responsibility for the successful work of personnel in related jobs and related brigades. The contracts concluded among related brigades along the entire technological chain guaranteed smooth and rhythmical work, daily implementation of planned assignments, elimination of idling, working time losses, unproductive labor and material outlays and creation of conditions for highly productive work by all workers employed within the same technological cycle. The system called for issuing a worker guarantee passport for any type of work done and goods produced. In this case the behavior of the worker in the production process is no longer determined by the extent of his responsibility for the quality results of his own work but by factors which determine his responsibility for ensuring through his own efforts the efficient and high quality work of the worker in a related profession and for obtaining high quality end results.

Brigade obligations and the worker guarantee passport issued to every worker and all brigades for all types of work and goods produced guarantee the fact that the real responsibility of the worker is assuming an increasingly meaningful content.

The drafting of individual five-year and annual plans for higher labor productivity, based on informing the individual workers of the assignments set by the State Plan to the enterprise, based on the experience of the Dinamo Plant in Moscow, formulated by determining (searching for) reserves at each workplace, is, essentially, a declaration which the individual worker

makes to society concerning the amount and quality of his labor contribution to the common project, which determines his further active responsible behavior at work and in the collective, consistent with the extent of his objective responsibility. Therefore, the objectively existing interconnection and interaction among the economic categories of planning and responsibility are manifested in particular in the fact that steps taken to improve planning also influence the development of relations of responsibility in their direct social form, increasing their objective nature and strength.

At the ZIL Production Association the creative comprehensive plans of workers, brigades, sectors and shops, based on contracts for creative cooperation between engineers and workers, the brigade and the technologist, designer and researcher, and the shop and the subdivisions of engineering and technical services became the organizational foundation for the extensive development of creative cooperation between workers and specialists in the area of technical improvements in the production process, under the slogan "Engineering Support for Worker Initiative." Here a significantly higher number of workers in different categories become involved in active relations of real ownership and the essential nature of their responsibility becomes increasingly clear. The contracts and creative comprehensive plans for worker responsibility for obtaining optimal national economic results along the entire technological chain starting with the birth of a product (from a scientific idea and design to the manufacturing of the finished good and its use based on test data) are materialized in accordance with a large number of factors and become the direct responsibility of the collective and the indirect responsibility of society.

The success of the duplication of progressive initiatives at other enterprises, as practical experience confirmed, was based on the extent to which their followers were able to reproduce the process of development and realization of responsibility. This has been manifested with particular clarity in the brigade forms of organization of labor and wages.

The system of brigade organization and labor incentive at enterprises and construction projects and units engaged in the production of finished goods in the countryside is a successful method for combining various means and methods for the development of responsibility relations, ensuring a leading part to asserting the direct social responsibility of the workers in their jobs. It would be difficult to implement the task set by the party of extensively developing the brigade form of the labor organization and incentive without understanding the dialectics of the establishment of responsibility relations in the collectives in the application of the new forms of brigade labor organization and incentive. For the blind duplication of the experience of the Kaluga turbine makers or Zelenograd construction workers is both essentially impossible and would fail to yield the necessary results under different technological, economic, social and organizational conditions. In order efficiently to use the experience of the brigade forms of labor organization on a broad scale by progressive collectives we must specifically identify, as Comrade K. U. Chernenko pointed out, the factors which have led to such successes. To this effect we must have theoretical knowledge of the necessary and adequate principles on which the organization of the experience



of frontrankers is based and the ways and means of influence (in the technological, economic, organizational and social production areas) on the development of responsibility relations and the dialectics of their establishment and advancement.

The brigade which creates the end product becomes the organizational form which ensures the synthesized influence on the worker of measures aimed at improving production equipment and technology and steps to improve planning and intensifying the effectiveness of cost accounting as a method for planned economic management aimed at enhancing labor effectiveness and work quality. This creates conditions which make it possible and necessary for every worker to have the type of behavior in the course of the production process which is determined by the effect of all factors which define the measure of responsibility for his work and provide the possibility of establishing the entire depth and volume of responsibility of the individual worker directly to society as a whole and to its members, to identify the direct relations of responsibility linking the individual worker with society and to ensure the possibility of society directly influencing the economic behavior of its members. In the final account this means organizing the interested behavior of the individual aimed at achieving optimal national economic results at a given enterprise with the lowest possible overall social labor outlays.

It is on this basis that the brigade system, as a study makes clear, ensures the materialization of responsibility relations in their entire structure and wealth and in the system of material incentive aimed at achieving end results.

This process is realized thanks to the fact that the brigade is assigned production areas and equipment: the workers are given the real opportunity to handle some of the public productive capital the co-owners of which they objectively are; the brigade is issued a detailed and overall plan for the five-year period, the year and the month, which is a direct component of the plant's state plan. The strict interconnection between these plans is defined and in this case the brigade plan becomes to its members a direct labor contribution expected by society. The brigade set--the end product of the work of the brigade, which may be an assembly or part of an assembly of a commodity which is a direct component of the end product of the enterprise, becomes the planning-accountability unit of all brigades.

To the worker the result of his labor is his direct contribution to the overall social product. Furthermore, planned assignments are set for increasing labor productivity and lowering the technological labor-intensiveness of the manufactured goods as a direct portion of the state assignments related to such enterprise indicators as a whole and issued to the worker as direct social assignments. As a result, to the individual worker responsibility for the efficiency of his work and of the brigade, production quality is a direct social factor, for the violation of deadlines for the manufacturing of the brigade set would violate the deadline for the production of the overall product of the enterprise and to the nonfulfillment of the social assignment. A new structure of production relations is created, the leading units of which are the brigades directly engaged in the manufacturing of the structural components of the overall product of the enterprise and the extent and



meaning of the responsibility of the individual worker become obvious along the entire path covered by the manufactured item in the course of production, interconnection and interdependence with related workers.

In this case orders and other payment documents are issued only for the brigade set, assigning a comprehensive time norm and valuation for the brigade as a whole, regardless of the specific performer within the brigade (however, they are entered in the report on the brigade set and added up in accordance with the regulations governing operational time norms and rates); the work of the entire brigade is oriented toward and rated on the basis of end results. The direct contribution of the individual to this end result appears as his direct contribution to the overall social product. Payments are based on the end results of the collective's work in accordance with the comprehensive norms and rates for the brigade set and the share of the piece-rate earnings in excess of the rates and all types of bonuses within the brigade are distributed by the collective itself in accordance with the coefficient of labor participation of the individual worker; it is thus that society directly assesses the end result of the work not only of the brigade collective but of the individual worker while the collective directly assesses the extent to which the individual workers shows his responsibility for labor and economic management results.

Methods such as general brigade meetings, brigade councils and councils of brigade leaders on all management levels, from shop foreman to the enterprise's general director, become an organic and active part of the structure of managing the production process and the collective at the enterprise, in such a way that, on the one hand, the responsibility of the administration to society for the fulfillment of the plan and improving production efficiency, work quality and labor discipline also becomes a direct responsibility to society assumed by all workers while, on the other hand, the direct responsibility of the administration and the engineering and technical services to the workers truly increases. The mechanism used in maintaining this responsibility substantially changes as well. It reflects the direct responsibility to the brigade and the continuing demand of the brigades for the creation of conditions for highly productive labor, uninterrupted and quality work and joint and interested search for possibilities and reserves.

Each one of these aspects is an element of the overall system of the materialized responsibility of the worker, ensured by the method of labor organization and incentive. Experience has proved that diminishing the significance of any one of the characteristic features in the organization of the new type brigades or taking any shortcut in assessing their significance lead to adverse consequences. It is precisely the failure to take fully into consideration the significance of one element or another within the system of responsibility relations which leads to the breakdown of some brigades or to their formal life. The conditions created in production with the use of brigade forms of labor organization and incentive and the relations which develop in this connection within the collectives are objective in terms of the individual worker and become factors which significantly increase his responsibility.

However, these conditions arise on the basis of improvements in the quantity, quality and condition of production forces and all components of labor

cooperation as such, for which reason they make consistent the behavior of the individual worker in the production process with the extent of his labor responsibility.

The study of the progressive experience in production and labor organization, based on the methodology of the problem described here leads to a number of conclusions of practical significance both in assessing the efficiency of progressive experience methods themselves and determining the direction of their further study.

The effect of the new working conditions which are created in this connection within the collectives and in the production process become more significant and, consequently, the materialized relations of responsibility as a method for their development more effective and the greater the number of factors which objectively determine the extent of responsibility of the individual working person, the greater the number of various worker categories necessarily adopt an active attitude toward real responsibility.

The effect intensifies when the ties of reciprocal responsibility and interdependence become clearer along the entire technological manufacturing chain until the end national economic product is obtained and when the responsibility of every worker for achieving in all sectors of the technological chain optimal national economic results is manifested as a direct responsibility to society at large, of which the worker becomes aware as the master of the socialist production process to the full extent of the economic meaning of this fact.

It is on the basis of the thus materialized direct social responsibility of the workers that the directed influences on the worker and the collective exerted by material incentive, material responsibility and cost-accounting levers and incentives become accurately consistent with historical necessity, ensure the development of a general communist nature of socialist responsibility relations and contribute to the realization by the broad working masses of the extent and depth of the economic content and their objective responsibility to society as a whole and to its individual members.

National economic practice proves that an assessment of the activities of higher levels in the management structure should not be limited at all to natural indicators in terms of value or even volume. The sector is responsible to society for the full satisfaction of specific social needs. In order properly to assess the work in railroad transportation, for example, it is quite insufficient to consider the increased volume of freight hauling by rail; one must use the measure to which the needs of society and the national economy for such haulage is satisfied. In order to assess the work of a sector producing consumer goods the satisfaction of the needs of society for high quality goods and services in the production of which the sector has specialized is of prime significance. The formulation of specific methods for such measurement has now become a vital need dictated by the increasing level of maturity of the direct social nature of socialist production and, consequently, the direct social form of responsibility relations.

Since responsibility in socialist economic relations is an objective economic category inherent in developed socialism, its development in a historically accurate direction requires a suitable mechanism for its implementation.

Such a mechanism cannot be invented. It requires a scientific study of the current level of development of socialist responsibility relation closely linked to economic policy, management and conscious human activities.

The laws of development of socialist responsibility relations within the economic mechanism operate at the junction of production relations with superstructural phenomena and conscious human activities and through the interaction of base and superstructure phenomena. The point is to become familiar with these laws and to provide them with the necessary scope for action. This is an important manifestation of the political approach to the economy and must be supported through the functioning of the socialist economic mechanism.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist, 1983

5003

CSO" 1802-99

## DEVELOPMENT OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF PLANNED PRICE SETTING

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 36-47

[Article by Prof A. Matlin, doctor of economic sciences]

[Text] Prices are one of the most important economic levers used in speeding up technical progress. The price system affects the effectiveness and intensification of socialist production. It is one of the means for upgrading the material and cultural standards of the Soviet people. The materials of the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum particularly emphasize the need to develop the principles of scientific price setting under the conditions of developed socialism and to improve the practice of planned price setting on a scientific basis.

### I

The specific price of a specific commodity is a direct object of study by the science of economics and the result of price-setting practice. Its definition is a complex and labor-intensive duty of the price-setting organs. In this case the difficulty is the lack of relatively few starting points for such work.

The price is the monetary manifestation of value or of the socially necessary labor outlays, while value is the manifestation of the law of price dynamics and setting. According to a general definition, the value of a commodity is a manifestation of a materialized amount of labor in volumes necessary for the satisfaction of social requirements with a socially normal level of equipment, technology and production organization. However, this general definition, which is adequate in terms of explaining price dynamics, is by far not sufficient for purposes of ensuring a scientifically substantiated price setting. The consideration of the requirements of the law of value indicates in general terms only the aspects which must be taken into consideration in the course of the price-setting process on the "microlevel," i.e., in terms of a specific price. The ratio between the social need and the outlay of social labor on this level is manifested in the ratio between consumer value and the outlays for the production of one or another commodity by a specific enterprise.

We know that a certain amount of labor, raw materials, materials and equipment must be used in the production of a specific commodity. All of this must be expressed in terms of money and the price of the finished product



must be set. However, the moment we approach closely the solution of this problem it immediately becomes clear that in this case we face more unknown than known facts. Wage outlays can be expressed in terms of cash; raw and other materials must be computed on the basis of current prices; the wear and tear of the equipment and other productive capital can be defined more or less accurately in accordance with the prices of the elements of such capital and the amortization (wear and tear) norms we have set ourselves. Briefly stated, in order to determine the price of a commodity we must have the prices of all the items needed for its production. Furthermore, we do not know in general the amount of the net income (profit) which has been created in the course of the labor process and we must proceed either from the "need" for a profit or from above-norm figures.

However, even if we have been able to compute all of this accurately, it does not follow that the thus-computed outlays are socially necessary. These are the specific outlays for a specific commodity which are necessary for its manufacturing by a specific enterprise. They could be objectively determined on the basis of the cost-accounting interests of the enterprise while remaining inconsistent with the interests of society.

The point is that, as a rule, the production process takes place in a number of enterprises with different labor productivity and different levels of equipment, technology and organization. How to act in cases when commodity production at a given enterprise is insufficiently efficient and substantially below the average level? We cannot close down this enterprise today. However, its technical retooling and reconstruction require time and capital investments. Furthermore, under the conditions of our planned system the necessary funds to this effect must be included in the plan. What if this has not been done? Logically, therefore, the price should be set by the plan and should include outlays for commodity production by the individual enterprise.

Let us assume that this is precisely what we have done (and what we actually do in practice). An enterprise with a very high production cost has become profitable and its output has been included in the plan. Backward and technically obsolete production has thus become a "normally operating enterprise." The "price setters" have been guided by the planning workers and the planning workers have been guided by the "price setters," as a result of which inefficient production has become efficient. A paradoxical situation arises according to which that which is good for the enterprise is considered for society. Yet it is the opposite which should prevail: If something is unprofitable for society it should be unprofitable for the enterprise.

The straight addition of actual outlays does not provide a satisfactory answer to the question of the price level. Nor are we helped by a consideration of cost-accounting conditions at the specific enterprise, particularly whenever the same type of commodity is produced by several enterprises simultaneously. Obviously, we could consider as normal working only an enterprise which operates on the basis of cost accounting with a price level set by the state. This approach alone is consistent with the implementation of the function of prices as a social norm of outlays.

The study of the problem of price setting in a number of sectors indicated that in frequent cases the produced commodities form groups of commodities of similar design and functional purpose or, in other words, parametric series. In the parametric series of similar commodities certain price ratios must be maintained: items with higher technical-economic and consumer features must, generally speaking, be relatively more expensive than items with lower parameters.

In machine building, for example, the production cost of individual commodities is frequently inconsistent with their productivity, capacity, power saturation and other parameters: a better machine may cost less and, conversely, a worse machine may be more expensive. Yet if we assume that all comparable models of machines are produced in a single plant and under identical production conditions and in the same volume, the ratios in terms of production costs and, therefore, prices, would be in direct contrast. Similar problems would exist in other sectors as well.

The solution of this problem led to the creation of the normative-parametric price-setting methods which have now become widespread. According to them, the sum total of production outlays for groups of structurally, technologically and fundamentally homogeneous items is considered as a single entity, i.e., there has been essentially a departure from the "traditional" consideration of the individual commodities. Within the groups the price ratios are structured not in terms of outlays but of consumer features. However, to begin with, the possibility of comparing items in terms of "usefulness" is limited to relatively small groups; secondly, consumer features have been given an economic rating depending on the relative level of outlays; thirdly, in the final account we have once again come to production outlays, this time applicable not to the individual commodity but to the group of comparable commodity types.

The need to master to an increasing extent the mechanism of action of the law of value on the basis of its conscious utilization becomes particularly clear in developments related to the study of prices and supply and demand ratios. Unfortunately, efforts to relate this ratio to the specific price of a specific commodity proved to be inadequate, for they were based on a comparison among economic phenomena operating at different levels.

Marxist economic science considers the law of value as a law of price setting and dynamics. If we proceed from the labor theory of value, we should not resort to an explanation of prices in terms of supply and demand. They do not explain anything whenever supply and demand are equal. In commenting on critical remarks on the subject of the labor theory of value, expressed by a bourgeois economist, F. Engels wrote that "...The famous Loria claims that this is nonsense. The correlation within which two commodities are exchanged expresses their value, and that is all. Consequently, the value is identical to the price and each commodity has as much value as the price it can fetch. The price is set by supply and demand and those who continue to ask questions and expect an answer are idiots" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 25, part II, pp 464-467).

Had the price indeed been determined by supply and demand, it would be unclear why the price dynamic itself influences supply and demand. Any price change changes demand for one commodity or another: as a rule, price increases reduce demand; price reductions, conversely, increase it. Furthermore, it is by far not mandatory that price changes for one commodity or another bring about changes in demand for precisely that commodity. We know that the size of demand does not change proportionally to prices. Demand does not explain anything in terms of prices, for demand itself, considered in physical terms, is nothing but the monetary income divided by the price of commodities.

The many price errors, particularly in retail trade, are related precisely to the fact that consumer demand is considered in terms of money, although under the conditions of our economy, it is defined by the plan. Attempts to "correct" the plan in terms of shaping the monetary income of population with the help of prices most frequently fail. Population demand depends not on the sum total of monetary income and savings but on entirely different factors. Let us name among them above all the sex and age, skill and professional structure of the population; the definitive or almost definitive availability of many types of cultural-household commodities and limiting the need for the amount of such commodities through technically substantiated replacements (in the case of refrigerators, washing machines, and so on); the shaping of demand for groups of interrelated and reciprocally complementing commodities and services (such as passenger cars, fuel, spare parts, technical services, expense and possibility of training new drivers, fines, and so on).

Let us further note that in itself the volume of available commodities as well cannot be reflected in terms of price. The price of a scarce product can be increased only up to a certain limit, after which demand for one commodity or another either disappears almost entirely or else hoarding begins to increase rapidly. Conversely, excess supply does not allow drop in prices below the level of production costs.

Naturally, the planned socialist economy excludes rivalry and uncontrolled shifting of capital from one sector to another and uncontrolled fluctuations of supply and demand. The offering of commodities is determined by the laws of socialist reproduction. Demand depends on distribution relations and the process through which the monetary income of the various population groups, enterprises and organizations is established.

Under our circumstances supply and demand are determined by the plan and prices should be adapted to the plan and become "planned balancing" prices. However, this is only on the surface. Supply and demand in their overall planned volume do not cover all factors which determine the planned price. A gap between the price and the value is possible up to a certain limit which must be known. Otherwise, on the one hand, unrealistic income will arise which does not correspond to the labor invested but which leads to surplus demand. On the other, the redistribution of values through prices could reduce without sufficient grounds demand on the part of individual organizations and persons. In other words, a deformation in demand will take place and a gap will develop between the measure of labor and the measure of consumption.

The setting of prices based on the ratio between supply and demand could substantially distort the development of the economy in the future. The point is that under the conditions of a planned economy, naturally, price changes cannot immediately affect existing production. Prices do not determine the choice of directions of capital investments for the production of one commodity or another based on planned requirements. Furthermore, prices are the initial prerequisite for determining the economic efficiency of draft plan decisions. Unfortunately, so far little attention has been paid to this aspect of the matter. Problems of price setting are considered essentially from the positions of the current situation: the cost accounting of operating enterprises in the case of wholesale and purchase prices and supply and demand in the case of retail prices. Actually, the most important consequences in terms of future developments are related to the use of prices in draft plan computations of the efficiency of economic decisions.

Therefore, at the present stage of economic development the level of our knowledge concerning the mechanism of the effect of the law of value and its practical mastery is such that a fully substantiated assessment was made at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, according to which we are "sometimes forced to act, so to say, empirically, using the very inefficient method of trial and error" (Yu. V. Andropov). In price setting this is manifested in the fact that apparently there is no new way to resolve arising problems on the basis of the specific price of a specific commodity. Even despite the unquestionable progress made in taking into consideration an increasingly broad range of factors in recent decades a number of problems remain unresolved.

The real socialization of socialist production has put on the agenda the question of converting from price setting of individual commodities to the comprehensive solution of the problem. As a socioeconomic system, developed socialism increasingly requires its own internal logic for price setting and an increasingly essential consideration of macroeconomic factors and national interests.

## II

The solution of the problem of planned price setting under developed socialist conditions requires the dialectical combination of the stipulations of Marxist-Leninist economic theory, the labor theory of value above all, in all its aspects pertaining to society which is guiding the production process on the basis of a unified plan which is founded on the public ownership of productive capital and the study of our practical reality.

The Marxist labor theory of value has never identified value with labor outlays. Value is not another term for labor outlays but a specific social relation. Marx wrote that "although the value of a commodity is determined by the quantity of the labor it contains that same quantity is determined socially" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 23, p 221).

After studying this "social way" of commodity production, based on private ownership, Marx named and explained commodity fetishism. The power which social relations have over people, expressed in the form of objects, is the



inevitable result of the shaping of values and prices on the market under the influence of competition.

Only one method exists for excluding commodity fetishism from human life. It is for society to learn and master the laws which govern the shaping of values. This possibility is achieved through centralized planned price setting as the "social way" of shaping values and prices, which is one of the important trends in the control exercised by society over the development of its own production relations.

The point is that Marx never defined the sum total of values as the result of average outlays for a given quantity of commodities. To the contrary, he always considered average outlays and prices as an ideal value obtained by dividing the sum total of values (or prices) by the quantity of commodities. That is precisely why Marx named the average values which mathematicians working in economics occasionally criticize, having failed to understand the heart of the matter.

We must point out that the need to develop the theory and practice of price setting increasingly requires a social, a national economic approach. On the one hand, the specific price of a specific commodity is the direct target of planned price setting. On the other, national economic balances become the instrument base for resolving common problems for they enable us to determine intercoordinated price levels of sectorial aggregates and profitability norms used in current price setting. The balancing of the entire price system in the country today is an entirely solvable problem on the scientific level, although in practical terms it requires the necessary sociopolitical and economic prerequisites which can be created only on the basis of a planned organization and deliberate efforts.

The balancing of the price system presumes the mandatory solution not only of the problem of outlays but also of determining the social consumer value. The labor theory of value ascribes the necessary importance to consumer value when it is truly essential in terms of an economic definition and takes the "social way" in determining the value of labor.

The fact that society must distribute the resources at its disposal in accordance with social requirements is absolutely unquestionable. If we consider not the individual commodity but the entire commodity mass, its dependence on the quantity of invested labor becomes equally clear. Marx was the first to discover the actual connection between the social need and the consumer value of a commodity. Furthermore, he clearly and convincingly proved the existence of internal relations between value and the consumer value of commodities wherever this connection actually exists. Concepts relative to consumer value play an important part in his study.

Let us consider some of these concepts which are of great importance in planned price setting. In undertaking the solution of this problem, Marx noted that to begin with we look at the "object" as having some useful features. It is clear that this "object" in itself, i.e., outside the method used to produce it and to consume it, cannot have an economic form, an economic definition. Therefore, those who would like to determine the useful

features of one "object" or another were directed by Marx to study commodity manuals. This equally applies to the ability of the "object" to meet a specific requirement. In this case it is a question of the attitude of the person toward the object, which has never been part of economic relations in terms of relations among people; it is a question of a "potential" consumer value, of the possibility of satisfying requirements with the help of a specific "object."

Let us assume that the "object" is the product of labor and truly satisfies a social requirement. At that point relations appear and exist among people as a result of the production and appropriation of the product which has specific useful features. The social requirement for such relations is the economic form through which the consumer value is manifested and the useful features of the "object" are acknowledged by the consumer. However, since it is a question of social requirements, the consumer value as well must be considered on the social scale. Therefore, Marx directly equates social need with consumer value on the social scale.

The social need is always a need for a specific quantity of goods with a specific quality. That is why it is precisely the social need which is the natural economic measure for the social consumer value. In this connection, Marx noted that "...a characteristic of the product as a consumer value is established through the overall need for the exchange of this product, i.e., through the volume of overall consumption. Overall consumption acts here as a measure of the product in terms of a consumer value.... The measure of the product as a consumer value is the amount of the need for this specific product..." (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, part I, pp 382-383).

In this sense, the argument as to the possibility of measuring the consumer value becomes absolutely meaningless. We not only can but in practice do measure the consumer value of a product whenever we find the volume of the social need for this product. Naturally, however, in this case no special measurement unit for consumer value or for "usefulness" appears. The amount of need for a product is determined in accordance with its physical nature.

It is entirely understandable that the volume of need is determined on a social scale in the course of its historical development. At any given moment the volume of the need depends on the quality of the product as the sum total of the specific useful features of the consumed object. Actually, even a very superficial approach would reveal that the relative volumes of need for bread and meat are related to the fact that bread is used in one case and meat in another. A specific need exists for each type of commodity and is determined by the specific features of that specific product and by its qualitative and specific characteristics.

The dependence of the volume of need on the useful features of the product of labor is not supernatural in the least. It is obvious, for example, that increasing the content of the useful component in ore means the need to use a lesser quantity of ore in metal production. In precisely the same way a lesser amount of more productive equipment is needed to perform a specific amount of work. Human nutrition requires a lesser amount of butter with a high fat content, and so on.

In this connection, Marx notes that "the natural characteristics of the product themselves include its measure. In order for the consumer value to become a universal form it must be present only in a specific quantity, a quantity the measure of which is found not in the materialized product of labor but is derived from the nature of this product as a consumer value, a consumer value to others" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 46, part I, p 383).

The true wealth of Marx's labor theory of value lies precisely in the fact that he determined the laws of interaction between consumer value and the value of commodities after studying the "social way" for determining the value of a given quantity of labor. This path proved to be difficult. The qualitative definition of a commodity shapes the quantitative value of the need for this commodity on the scale of the society. Society correlates its needs with the quantity of labor at its disposal. It is precisely in the course of this process that the "weighing" of the value and the consumer value takes place, which was described by Engels in his first economic work: a concept which some economists are trying to interpret in the spirit of the theory of usefulness.

In terms of planned price setting these concepts are of basic importance. They indicate the specific place and significance of the social need in the price-setting process. Naturally, in a planned economy the size of the social need must be determined by the plan. However, control over the substantiation of the need from the viewpoint of the consistency between its satisfaction and the possibilities of society can be achieved only through planned price setting. In the final account, lowering production costs and prices in some cases on the basis of the unit of useful effect is a natural measure of the economic substantiation of the plan itself.

Under the conditions of a socialist economy, Marx's theory of the social consumer value and its relation to value and price has yet another aspect extremely interesting from the scientific point of view and quite relevant practically. It is that the determination of prices and their structural elements on a social scale must be fully consistent with the volume and structure of the consumer values produced within society. The interconnection between material and value (monetary) proportions is a criterion for the substantiation and accuracy of planned price setting.

Marx's theory of reproduction is a specific application and development of his idea on the correlation between value and consumer value. For the first time in the history of the science of economics he explained the proportions of reproduction of the social product and the breakdown of the latter into consumer value (into two subdivisions) and in terms of value.

What directly follows from this is that the socialist society has indeed additional possibilities of setting prices in accordance with the socially necessary labor outlays, setting them in such a way that the price as a whole as well as each one of its components have a fully defined material content. This is natural in terms of the price itself, for it is always set per unit of consumer value.

This is not so obvious in terms of the structural elements of the price, although Marx's theory of reproduction offers entirely clear answers to this by relating the value of the structure of the commodity to its material composition.

In practice, the various structural elements within the price change under the influence of the characteristics of cost accounting, the financial-credit system and the tasks of economic policy. In all deformations, however, we must link the monetary elements of the price both to each other and to their material structure. In the opposite case there are inevitable disturbances in the reproduction process and the appearance of surplus or scarcity of money in circulation.

Here is an example: payments for geological surveys were introduced for most extracting industry sectors during the review of wholesale prices in 1966-1967; such payments were substantially increased in the subsequent review which started in 1982. We shall not dwell on the reasons which made this step necessary. Let us assume that it can indeed contribute to the better utilization of minerals. Let us pay attention to another aspect of the matter. Outlays for geological surveys were and are financed by the state budget, i.e., at the expense of the net social income, without creating directly any material product whatsoever. The "product" of geological surveys is only information on the location of minerals, which may or may not be used.

If we decide that it would be more expedient to compensate for such outlays through enterprise production costs or profits, we should not increase but reduce by this amount contributions to the budget from profits, previously used for the same purpose. Actually, this was not done: the profitability norm remained the same and additional payments were made to the budget not covered by material resources. A similar situation prevails with payments for water and some other income which has no material backing.

Here is another example: payments for capital assets were introduced in industry in 1965. Their amount was defined as the accumulations norm: the ratio between the volume of capital investments in the growth of productive capital and the overall volume of basic industrial-production assets. In the national economy payments for capital assets were thus given a specific purpose: to provide financial resources needed to ensure the stable net growth of basic productive capital. The monetary form was consistent with the material content.

That was not what happened in practice. Other sources not allocated for such purposes were drawn into financing capital investments, including a certain share of the profit contained within the prices of industrial commodities. As a result, on the one hand a surplus of funds developed, directed into capital investments, compared with the volumes of material resources produced to meet construction needs. On the other hand, prices rose and so did production costs.

Today most economists favor the definition of the net income in prices by introducing payments for the use of resources by production enterprises.



Without disputing the possible expediency of this step we would like to draw the attention merely to the fact that, to begin with, payments for resources should include the real social outlays for the reproduction of said resources; secondly, we should exclude from the profits and other net income in setting prices consistent with the funds channeled into reproduction payments for resources. Otherwise we would disturb the proportionality of reproduction through the appearance of monetary income not consistent with material output and an inevitable price increase.

It is sometimes said that the appearance of new forms of net income (payments for assets, geological surveys, water, etc.) did not result in an increase and redistribution of monetary income but merely increased monetary circulation. Nevertheless, the consequences remain the same: monetary circulation was separated from the circulation of material values. In other words, the objective reproduction laws were violated.

The clearest example in this respect is the problem of amortization withholdings and restoration of written-off productive capital. Amortization withholdings are a share of the earnings from the sale of goods set aside for the purpose of replacing operating productive capital once it has been fully amortized. Since the productive capital operates for several years, every year a proportional share of the value of the productive capital is included in production costs so that when the time comes to replace such capital the necessary amortization funds will be available. Understandably, until the need to replace productive capital appears, amortization withholdings are temporarily available funds which, naturally, become credit resources. Such funds are substantial: for 1982 alone they totaled some 28 billion rubles in industry for amortizing the full value of productive capital, paid for by the purchasers.

Actually, no more than one-third of this amount was used for the renovation of productive capital. The rest was channeled into nonrecoverable financing of capital investments. Therefore, whenever the real need arises to replace worn-out productive capital the necessary funds will be unavailable.

The result of this kind of financial operation is the following: the renovation of productive capital in industry is delayed, the enterprises age and are unable to meet the necessary growth of labor productivity, production quality and economic and efficient management. We speak of scientific and technical progress while at the same time we do not use for their specific purpose huge funds which should be used to keep our production machinery in order. Enterprises and entire industrial sectors grow old like people. This is a natural process and is not terrible at all. Unlike people, the production process is fully capable of rejuvenation. Its "youth" lies in fast growth rates, modern technology and better satisfaction of social requirements.

### III

The laws which govern the development of production forces are above all those of reproduction. It is these laws, manifested on the national economic and social level, which determine planned price setting. As we pointed out,

price setting can be substantiated only if monetary proportions in the national economy (to the extent to which they are defined through prices) are consistent with the material structure of social production.

A scientifically substantiated, objective and, in a certain sense, uncompromising price system could be one of the foundations for structuring a working economic mechanism. This must be particularly mentioned, for in works dealing with the economic mechanism the main attention is focused on the economic conditions governing the functioning of the primary unit within the national economy--the production enterprise--and its interrelationships with other enterprises and with the national economy as a whole.

The price must compensate for production costs within socially normal amounts and include a certain amount of net income distributed among profits or otherwise. However, the size of this net social income cannot be determined on the basis of the cost-accounting interest of the enterprise but must be a truly net social income.

From this point of view the problems of computing the net income of society in terms of price setting should greatly depend on the type of commodity and the type of price. If we consider the entire national economy as a single entity but act otherwise in price setting, we must distinguish between the output of a state enterprise to be used by another state enterprise and output to be marketed to the population, the kolkhozes, or abroad.

In the first case the net income (profit) of the enterprise is not the net income (profit) of society. For example, the profit of a mine from selling coal to an electric power plant is part of the production cost of the electric power. If some of this profit is paid to the state budget and used, for example, to finance the construction of a school, this would disturb the balance of the economy. Indeed, in the first place, there would be no construction materials to cover such profits or consumer goods for the construction workers. Secondly, what the budget would receive as profit society would lose as increased production cost and, subsequently, price of electric power.

Therefore, the structure of the reproduction process requires that we limit profits from goods used for industrial use to a minimal level needed for purposes of enterprise cost accounting and economic incentive. This minimum can be exceeded only to the extent and the share of the output of a given sector, let us say coal, marketed to the population, institutions in the nonproduction area and construction. At that point withholdings from profits for the budget will be truly consistent with budget outlays for heating the schools, hospitals, etc.

The point is that the net income included in the price of a commodity in one sector or enterprise or another does not have to correspond in the least to the outlays in this sector for expanded reproduction. The system of "self-financing" of sectors and enterprises, which is supported by many people as being similar to cost-accounting on the sectorial level and a prerequisite for the use of economic management methods in the national economy, may in fact be fraught with serious adverse consequences in "mechanical" approaches to the problem.

The price in one sector or another may include the net income only to the extent of the volume of output which will actually be used as net income, i.e., for the social consumption and accumulation funds. Only in such a case can we avoid violations of reproduction proportions and the consequent lowering of production efficiency and price increases.

If under such price-setting circumstances the enterprises can secure their cost accounting and the sectors their "self-financing" system, such cost accounting and self-financing would be truly "healthy," for in this case the interests of the enterprise and the sector would coincide with those of the public and society will be protected from price increases.

The problem of the stimulating function of prices should also be raised in connection with the problem of cost accounting. For some reason, this function is conceived one-sidedly: the higher the price the better the incentive. It is ignored in this case that a higher price gives the right to the manufacturer to earn more money than the real possibility of purchasing with which funds the necessary productive capital and consumer goods is most frequently ignored, although it is precisely this which is of decisive importance in terms of incentive. Furthermore, at the price-setting stage we can compute only the expected rather than the actual effect. The experience in the development of our economy since 1965 indicates that this system is subject to constant breakdowns.

It breaks down above all because we try to ensure production intensification essentially by producing new equipment and updating machine-building output. This "strong point" for providing material incentive for production intensification cannot be reliable, for even the most modern and highly productive equipment could be set up under the type of operational conditions which would prevent it from yielding proper results. This could be due to a number of reasons such as lack of coordination of equipment in industry.

That this is so is confirmed by the fact of the steady decline in capital returns, i.e., in the summed-up productivity of capital assets. Capital returns are declining although in planning equipment and drafting normative-technical documents and setting prices economic results are always apparent.

If we are guided not by the wishes of the developers of new equipment but by end national economic results, we should be interested in the production of new commodities and even more so in improving technological processes, for in the final account the final answer is provided by technology. The intensification of technological processes, i.e., the acceleration of the production process, involves pace, output and reduced outlays. We do not need new equipment in general but only the type of new equipment which changes the technology; we need a new technology.

Could we stimulate the development and utilization of new technology with the help of prices? We not only can but must. The only way to resolve this problem is to set not high but low prices for goods produced with the help of obsolete technology. We must create the type of economic conditions under which the production enterprises and sectors would be unable to produce expensive and substandard goods. At that point they would be forced to

improve their technology and convert to more economical and less labor-intensive output.

The manufacturers should orient their prices toward the use of progressive technology and normal organization of production work. In such cases the enterprises would demand the new equipment which would give them real results.

However, this requires the type of price setting which would be free from sympathy for lagging and unskilled enterprises, would stand strictly on the positions of protecting the public interests and would ensure true social control over the measure of labor. In planning the production process the interests of each department and enterprise could be taken into consideration if it is clear that during the planned period the output "would not be turned inside out." This should not exist in planned price setting, for losses, subsidies and low profitability are indicators of difficulties within a given department or enterprise. This is also a signal not of the need to revise prices but to develop and carry out essential measures aimed at improving the technology, organization, management and planning of the production process.

In our economic system we draft our plans, implement them and assess their implementation ourselves. Under these circumstances, the formulation of a price system which would reflect the socially necessary labor outlays and ensure a precise consistency between monetary income and material output is the only means with the help of which society can influence reduced production costs and increased efficiency, force the economic organizations to increase their flexibility, urge on production rationalization and intensification and thus create truly healthy sources for our growth and further progress.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11



## ECONOMIC MECHANISM FOR THE FORMULATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF INTENSIVE PLANS BY COLLECTIVES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 48-59

[Article by USSR Academy of Sciences Corresponding Member P. Bunich]

[Text] The most important task today is radically to upgrade production efficiency. This is the only way to ensure the necessary improvements to the material and cultural standards of the people. The solution of this problem is determined to a decisive extent by the quality of the economic management mechanism. Unfortunately, this mechanism is not fully consistent with the contemporary stage of developed socialism and requires substantial improvements. "The economic management system, our entire economic mechanism need major reconstruction," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, party Central Committee general secretary, noted at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum.

In order to make the economic mechanism adequate to current production forces and the potential of production relations, the party and the government have undertaken to draft a program for the comprehensive advancement of the entire management system. This will include improvements in the organizational structure in planning, and enhancing the efficiency of all economic levers and incentives.

The existing incentive system has become insufficiently effective. It has become the weak spot of the economic mechanism, its bottleneck and stress center. That is why, in my view, its reorganization promises to yield the greatest possible results and will help to breathe new life into the other management elements. In defining the range of central problems which must be considered in 1984, among the problems requiring particular attention, for the first time the CPSU Central Committee Politburo included improvements in the economic mechanism and establishing the levers and incentives for economic development.

We must formulate and implement measures which will enhance the prestige and energy of the work and apply them in all related units and areas of the economy with the necessary sequence of immediate and more distant stages, i.e., systematically in the full meaning of the term. Any reduction in the real scales of the required changes, replacing them with halfway measures which reflect the inertia of the views which prevailed in the past would not yield the necessary results. Also quite unsuitable are the results of inventing quasireformist economic hybrids, artificial indicators and inviolable structures which lead to a loss of pace and mistrust in subsequent extensions and suggestions.

The problem of the elaboration of incentives is difficult. However, its main aspect, its "critical mass" is the procedure applied in assessing the activities of collectives. Today such assessment is based on the degree and percentage of implementation of planned assignments. The collective which has overfulfilled its plan is considered the best and the one which underfulfilled it, the worst. Initially, in terms of a planned economy this procedure is not only accurate but the only possible one. However, let us take a closer look. Today occasionally the plan fulfillment indicators do not reflect its intensiveness, economy, updating difficulty and planned prospects. Their use in incentives places in a privileged position enterprises which increased their planned outlays by contemplating excessively high norms of raw and other material outlays, lowering stipulations relative to production capacities and labor productivity and reducing results, such as volumes of output, indicators of production quality, profit, and payments to the benefit of society.

There is no problem when the plan calls for a loss or low profitability. Its implementation would be rewarded in full for the strict observance of stipulated assignments. Conversely, if substantial profits have been stipulated and the plan has been fulfilled, in this case as well the reward would be roughly the same. Scientific and technical progress in such a system creates additional difficulties for enterprises which have been assigned to install new equipment rather than to assume leading economic positions in the sector. The low quality of commodities does not entail a loss if it is legalized with the plan. Instead, it is a factor which facilitates the work; high quality, if included in the assignment, is not a merit but a source of further concern. Enterprises which create little national income and those on which everything relies prove to be equally viable.

Financial prosperity depends on compromises reached between the production collective and the superior bodies at the time of the formulation of the plan for the distribution of income and on who will persuade whom, rather than on the actually earned financial resources by the enterprise. Therefore, the collectives which find themselves in the best position are those which have been able to acquire maximal budget investments and have "substantiated" a high share of the profit. This offers many enterprises the possibility of ordering expensive equipment which does not yield the necessary results and to pay for new construction which, as a selective study has shown, averages twice the cost planned by the project, which shows a conniving attitude toward the dioptric effects suggested by design organizations, accumulating excessive material resources and increasing working capital norms.

Collectives which have been issued intensive assignments are forced to invest all their efforts in their implementation. They must think of fulfilling rather than overfulfilling the plan. The leading enterprises must carry yet another load: they must compensate for the low plans of undereffective collectives. Furthermore, associations and ministries constantly shift unfulfilled assignments from poorly to successfully operating enterprises. In frequent cases to be a frontranking enterprise appears unprofitable.

In all such cases the plans remain unstressed. They create significant reserves of working time. Aspirations to acquire such plans and their overfulfillment are strictly kept in check.

The simplistic approach to assessing the work of collectives on the basis of the "plan" enables them to maneuver with and even manipulate the results of the fulfillment of assignments. If the goods are not needed to meet the plan they are marketed later. The practice of underloading the first three-quarters and overloading the last one is extensively applied in the quarterly breakdown of planned assignments. As a result, the plans for three-quarters of the year remain overfulfilled, for which substantial bonuses are paid. The plan for the fourth quarter is not fulfilled and bonuses drop. For the year as a whole, such bonuses exceed the stipulated amounts based on the even increases of planned assignments.

Despite the criticism, the practice of amending plans remains strikingly durable. As a study of activities of enterprise groups has revealed, such corrections are made on an average of twice annually. Had the collectives been judged on the basis of factual income, no plan amendments would bring more money or turn black into white. However, since it is the percentage of plan fulfillment rather than real income which is taken as a base, many enterprises find plan corrections desirable.

Wherever disparities exist between real and planned contributions, the doubtful talent of drafting a "skillful" report is considered valuable. An enterprise may be classified among the best in the sector according to the extent to which the brigade form of labor organization is applied. However, the brigades which are set up are minuscule, consisting of three to four workers. The single order has been reduced to the fact that the foreman gives a set of orders to the brigade leader while the brigade leader assigns them to the collective. The initiative of applying a system of efficiency and quality is quickly adopted. However, intentions are rarely implemented in full. Solemn meetings are held to celebrate the completion of a project which, as it turns out, has not been completed yet. We cannot speak of a passive, an idle attitude. Activeness exists, unquestionably, but is directed elsewhere. The energy of such managers is largely concentrated on avoiding additional assignments, blaming "objective reasons" or related enterprises for their errors and hiding behind the large number of formal conferences, "measures taken," and collegial and collective responsibility.

Since production outlays stipulated in the plan are considered normal they are also averaged. The price-setting organs are struggling for prices not to exceed the effect of the goods produced and, furthermore, to be reduced per unit of results. However, the customers who are allowed by the plan to purchase productive capital at higher prices and who have wide access to state financial resources generously claim results which are 30 to 50 percent above the real ones. This is precisely what the suppliers need in order to cover their excessive outlays. This leads to another increase in outlays and another round of price increases. The prices provide for normative payments to the budget. If any given sector is allocated bigger capital investments, such investments are sometimes included in the price in order to avoid

excessive financial "transfers" among sectors. In this manner the "production cost" is not broken down into structural components but becomes the result of their sum. Consequently, the most effective goods and sectors are hard to determine, whereas the worst on which excessive resources have been spent appear normal. The mechanism of reducing industrial outlays to the socially necessary ones is not used to the proper extent. Hence the phenomenon of social dependence.

The conversion to the indicator of normative net output reduces the interest of the collective in increasing prices which include excessive outlays. Material costs are no longer considered in determining the wage fund. However, to begin with, the NChP [normative net output] is also frequently "determined" by the price, although by the partial rather than the full price (to the extent of the newly created value). Secondly, the economy is not limited to the use of partial prices, it needs the full prices. Therefore, the use of the NChP coexists with the full "constituent" price. This price determines the cost of purchased materials and withholdings for the economy achieved by the enterprises. Let us also remember that the profit norm included in the price of the commodity on the scale of the sector is set in terms of the value of productive capital, after which, based on the specific products, it is divided between amortizations and wages. The existing economic management mechanism retains a number of additional incentives to use expensive materials. If a plan is drafted according to the "base" method it is easier to achieve the required production growth by producing goods with high material costs. In order to come maximally close to reaching the indicator of contracted variety, the enterprises prefer the use of material-intensive goods which facilitate the fulfillment of the overall plan. The stipulated bonus for overfulfilling the marketing plan, naturally, makes it profitable to overfulfill assignments above all in terms of material-intensiveness. Particularly encouraged are above-plan profits, which are needed for covering insufficient working capital and for adding to the material-incentive fund based on savings on wages, and others, is particularly encouraged. The higher the cost of raw materials used the easier it becomes to increase the sum of above-plan profits.

The inadequacy of incentives for drafting an intensive plan from below has led to a series of measures of state influence on the collectives, aimed at increasing planned assignments. Planning according to the "base" appeared, the purpose of which was to prevent a reduction in the pace already reached. However, such planning is unsatisfactory, for it determines future developments on the basis of the past. It faces the past rather than the future. The greatest errors arise in planning according to the "base," in cases of long- and medium-term planning, i.e., in defining long-term processes which are incomparably newer and unparalleled compared to processes on hand, which impeccably duplicate current achievements.

Planning on the basis of the level reached also led to increasing the plans of properly working collectives in all indicators...other than the wage fund which is based on the previous rates (tariffs). Workers with the same grade and qualifications earn approximately the same wage everywhere, although in some enterprises labor productivity is higher and in others lower.



In order to equalize the wages, the former are issued higher production norms compared to the latter. Such equalization applies also to the incentive funds which are annually planned according to norms per individual ITR [Engineering and Technical Worker] and individual worker. If a collective has achieved above-plan savings, part of them will go into the current incentive funds but will be excluded in establishing the funds for the following year, when once again they will be computed on the basis of norms per worker. Such funds may be even reduced if the number of workers has been reduced.

Although in absolute terms, per worker, the incentive used at all enterprises is more or less the same, if we were to introduce the concept of the labor effort required to reach such earnings it would turn out to be lesser at the worse enterprises than at the better. The use of unnecessary production factors, tremendous state investments and budget subsidies with modest results are nothing but an indicator of the low real density and intensive-ness of production rated excessively high. In other words, frequently the distribution benefits those who work less efficiently rather than the front-rankers and violates the system of rewards based on production results. Let us recall as an example the hardship of the Azot Production Association in Shchekino which, having harnessed a number of reserves, was given a more intensive plan and encountered difficulties. A relative decline in the wage fund per unit of output took place at other enterprises in Shchekino which applied the Shchekino method: the timber-processing combine, the Kislotoupor Plant and the plan for repairs of technological equipment. Is it amazing that under such circumstances this method is used by no more than 5 percent of all industrial enterprises in the RSFSR? The fear of being issued in the future a plan based on the level reached restrains the adoption of counter-plans as well, although they are encouraged by granting additional benefits.

2

The method for assessing enterprise activities depends on enterprise autonomy. If this autonomy is extremely small, not only the basic but the detailed parameters of the work of the collectives are determined from above and their work can be assessed only by determining the degree of utilization of the resources allocated from above and the percentage of the fulfillment of the plan for outlays and revenue rather than the level reached. If the enterprises are granted extensive rights, thanks to which they can greatly influence the direction of their work and the accumulation and expenditure of material, labor and financial resources, along with the implementation of the plan, they can and must be answerable for the level of the plan; an assessment may be made of their actual contribution to the national income and of their actual production efficiency.

In turn, independence does not operate autonomously. It is not always the same under all circumstances but stems from historically variable values and from the entire overall mechanism of management at different stages. Starting with the industrialization of the country, objective circumstances existed for reducing autonomy. Naturally, this situation was dictated by the task of concentrating resources in the hands of the state in order to create a large number of new enterprises and to develop new territories, when a

great deal of products were extremely scarce and were distributed from the center, while the local areas were short of skilled management cadres. Material and financial resources were allocated not on the basis of the extent of the enterprises' solvent demand but on the basis of the policy of accelerated development of heavy industry which, at the stage of its establishment was, naturally, underprofitable and insolvent. The choice of consumers and priority in allocating material and financial assets were included in the centralized plan as a direct control over the dynamics of natural-monetary flows. Under those circumstances a differentiation of profitability in terms of prices was of no determining significance. Prices with a low conventional-cost accounting profitability were considered adequate, although they did not always ensure sources for expanded self-reproduction. To a certain extent this reduced the accuracy of decisions, making them approximate and intuitive. All in all, however, few grave errors were made. The small scale of the economy simplified computations and the needs and means to satisfy them were relatively clear, simple and unconditional.

Today conditions are different. The most important factors for the growth of the autonomy of production collectives at the present stage are the following:

Increasing the share of reconstruction of operating production facilities compared to building new ones;

Accelerating and expanding scientific and technical progress, which presumes a high rate of economic changes, many of which must be handled by the enterprises;

Increasing material and other reserves needed in balancing national economic ratios under the conditions of the extensive autonomy of production collectives;

The increased skills of management cadres and the participation of the masses in enterprise management.

In the course of industrialization the gap in the capital-labor ratio between the new and the old enterprises widened. This excluded their rating on the basis of the level of efficiency. Today a conversion to an identical efficiency criterion becomes entirely justified.

During the period of creation of new enterprises and developing new territories economic relations were insufficiently economical for a while. After the organization of efficient work and the inclusion in the economy of a number of useful areas for the deployment of production forces, such relations reached a most profitable and rational level. In turn, this equalized the enterprises and strengthened the basis for converting to an evaluation of their work based on their efficiency level.

The intensified division of labor leads to the further unification and socialization of production and objective increases the importance of centralized planning in the country's progress. However, the division of labor

also requires the development of independence. Thus, the need to broaden the rights of enterprises grows with the intensification of the division of labor from general production--fuel and so on--to specialized, "personalized" items based on cooperation, in the course of which changes in one assembly suggested by the manufacturers should be efficiently coordinated with the final product. Technical policy must be harmonized between the end product and its components.

The 26th CPSU Congress stipulated that the further expansion of the autonomy and rights of associations and enterprises must become the general trend to be followed in their management. The same course was reasserted by the party in the Food Program, which notes the need to upgrade the organizational-economic autonomy of kolkhozes and sovkhozes. The USSR Law on Labor Collectives and on Increasing Their Role in the Management of Enterprises, Establishments and Organizations calls for ensuring true socialist self-management and developing long-term and current work plans initially by the collectives themselves.

At the February 1984 Central Committee Plenum, Comrade K. U. Chernenko set the following task: "Display on all levels greater autonomy. Daringly undertake searches and, if necessary, justified risks for the sake of upgrading the efficiency of the economy and improving the well-being of the people: that is what we expect of our economic cadres." The noted process of enhancing the role of enterprises in the formulation of all types of plans (long-term, medium-term and current) is extending earlier processes according to which the enterprises were essentially given rights not in basic but in counterplanning and not in long-term but current plans.

This does not mean that autonomy allegedly excludes centralization or that they are opposites. Centralization was, is and remains the most important advantage of a planned economy. It is a question of new methods for the implementation of centralized plans carried out essentially with the help of economic instruments which combine decisions made by superior bodies with effective incentives and responsibility on the part of enterprises for the sake of high end production results.

The USSR Gosplan drafts more than 600 material balances within a 5-year period and more than 2,000 as part of the annual plan. The USSR Gosplan breaks down production and distribution into as many as 15,000 items and ministries into as much as 50,000. The national economy produces several million different items of industrial and agricultural commodities. The breakdown of the variety plan from tens of thousands of ministerial "assemblies" to tens of millions of specific contracts between suppliers and consumers constitutes the wide area of enterprise autonomy.

The opinion has become rooted according to which "input" and "output" prices must be eliminated in assessing production. For this reason consumers of industrial commodities are indifferent to any reduction in the price of commodities they purchase. Nor are they particularly concerned with improving their goods as here again the results are corrected through price changes. The "neutrality" of prices weakens concern for the study of demand and timely

updating of variety and leads to other negative consequences. A line of surmounting this trend is being followed currently. The enterprises affect prices through the effect of their output which determines the upper limit of the wholesale price. Price markups and discounts are clearly considered factors which depend on the collectives. If less expensive materials are used in the manufacturing of goods the prices of the end products remain unaffected.

The corrections made to the basic draft plans on a centralized basis are being increasingly supported by economic measures. For example, if such corrections have resulted in a reduced income, what becomes profitable to society becomes profitable to the collectives thanks to the relatively high wholesale prices, facilities in terms of financial obligations, higher norms for incentive funds, use of centralized reserves, subsidies and so on. This means a centralized planned order issued from above, fully supported by cost-accounting and profitable both to society and the collectives.

Thus, purchase prices for commodities sold to the state by losing or under-profitable agricultural enterprises are combined with markups which, on an annual basis, total 9.8 billion rubles (to a certain extent such markups also equalize different soil-climatic conditions and location differences, for zonal prices are set on an averaged basis). The production of goods for children, sold at relatively low retail prices, is encouraged with high wholesale prices which are essentially another form of subsidy. Initially, sometimes over periods of years, developments based on inventions and discoveries and radical innovation from the viewpoint of the ratio between results and outlays, do not provide reasons for any euphoria. However, it is precisely they which lead into the future, rather than those which have long been mass-produced and are today providing high commercial results but are eventually doomed to disappear. On this basis, the state provides a 50 percent markup to the wholesale price of new, highly effective commodities and goods bearing the state Emblem of Quality, providing that their production is based on developments properly accepted as discoveries or inventions. Special measures are taken to stimulate goods for export: export subsidies, advantageous export credits and additional bonuses are used. The allocation of credits for measures consistent with the national economic plan and customs policies, which favor the development of domestic production, and others play an important role in the economic measures applied to make what is profitable to society profitable to the collectives.

Conversely, if as a result of centralized decisions the income of one economic cell or another increases, such an increase, obtained without effort on the part of the collective, is appropriated by society. Therefore, incentives for five-year plan indicators higher than the control figures and their implementation, regardless of the activities of ministries and associations (enterprises) are based not on the higher but the established norms.

In the current management model, there is no development of independence which reduces the area of centralization. Centralization does everything it deems necessary, only not through primarily administrative but economic regulations. If autonomy becomes broad but the centralized economic impact of society is lost, such a system would be no better than a system in which



autonomy has been excessively restricted and centralization has become excessive. This means that a good management mechanism should be determined not by a maximum or minimum of autonomy or a maximum or minimum of centralization, but by autonomy under centralization, precisely on the scale needed for making social corrections.

Autonomy is one side of the coin on the other side of which is responsibility. A great deal is demanded of those who have been given much. Demand is based on the level of the rights which were granted. The question has now risen of the responsibility of collectives not only for the implementation of resolutions formulated by superiors but their very adoption, i.e., for activities as a whole and their results. If such practices become widespread no one would be able to shift his faults to others and no one would fear that the successes of some would compensate for the shortcomings of others. Everyone would be responsible for his work and payments for such work will be fully consistent with results. Instead of making unrestricted "gifts" of state funds an expedient self-financing system would be used in which outlays would be paid for by the collectives and the largest outlays would be controlled on a centralized basis and the funds allocated for the solution of tactical problems would be left entirely at the disposal of the collectives. Self-financing also includes the crediting mechanism: for the first group of outlays it would be in accordance with national economic ratios and assignments; for the second, it would be according to the actual requests from the local areas and within the limits of available credit resources. The course of self-financing is already followed in the increased share of profits left at the disposal of enterprises, the conversion of sectorial ministries to the distribution of profits based on shares and the expanded area of credit investments for planned and unplanned needs. Redistributed sources are left to finance basic science, development and production of essentially new and complex types of commodities, primary geological surveys, development of new areas, development of the social infrastructure and other specific outlays.

The material dependence of the collective on overall results creates an atmosphere of general activeness and intolerance of parasites, violators of the discipline and plunderers of socialist property. Everyone becomes involved in management. "...The minds of dozens of millions of creative workers create something immeasurably greater than even the greatest and most brilliant prediction" (V. I. Lenin, "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 35, p 281).

In turn, the economic manager is placed under conditions in which he must harness all reserves, display initiative, determine the capabilities of the people and take admissible risks. He must think of the immediate and more distant future. He must be familiar with and shape demand and struggle for the renovation of output, its high quality and the reputation of the firm among consumers.

Under such economic conditions the workers begin to control better their colleagues and partners. They show greater exigency toward superior management levels and planning, financial and procurement bodies. Thus, the consumer has the right to order progressive items from the supplier to whom he has

been assigned. On this basis, for example, the GAZ Production Association refused to sign a contract for steering wheels made of etrol, produced by the Lyubuchanskiy Plastics Plant in Moscow Oblast and demanded that they be replaced by steering wheels made out of polypropylene. The state arbitration authority of the RSFSR Council of Ministers rejected the demand of the manufacturer to force the consumer to sign a contract for steering wheels made of etrol.

The work of the procurement bodies includes elements of economic responsibility. The Main Union Supply and Marketing Administration must pay an association a fine for delayed submission of data on future requirements and annual orders (in turn, the association must pay a fine to the Main Procurement Administration for delays in submitting projects and approved production plans). The procurement organs also pay fines for violating deadlines for issuing contracts both to suppliers and consumers (if the owner of capital has violated the deadline for submitting to the procurement organ which issues orders data on the breakdown of assets the fine must be paid by the owner of capital).

Elements of responsibility are found among the superior economic organs as well. For example, if property damage caused by an enterprise is the result of changes in the planned assignment, the industrial association must resolve the problem of its compensation. This is occasionally done. Thus, the Soyuzavtoelektropribor VPO [All-Union Production Association] issued an additional assignment to the Kuybyshev Plant for Automotive and Tractor Electrical Equipment imeni A. M. Tarasov, but failed to supply it with the proper resources. As a result, the contract with the ZIL PO [Production Association] was violated and the VPO covered the resulting losses.

The arbitration authorities could exempt the supplier from concluding a contract and from the payment of fines for failure to make deliveries according to the contract if he has been given an unbalanced plan.

It is particularly important that planning strengthen the assessment of actual results. The aspiration to achieve high-level production efficiency is the greatest incentive for the collective to acquire optimally stressed plans and to improve their balancing. The point is that in the complex contemporary economy, with its profound division of labor, we cannot achieve high-level efficiency outside the plan and outside the timely conclusion of contracts for production marketing and the delivery of raw and other materials, subcontracting, and so on. In enterprises whose plan has been lowered and whose wages and development depend on actually earned amounts, such funds would turn out to be less than at enterprises with stressed plans. In such cases any reduction in assignments would bring about insufficient wages. It would slow down scientific and technical progress and, as a result, will increase cadre turnover. Collectives which work according to stressed plants can not only retain but increase their cadres. Therefore, this system could be described with full justification as an encouragement for adopting a strict plan and implementing it. Furthermore, the plan will be "protected" first of all by economic penalties imposed on those who violate it and, secondly, a future reduction in preplan requests for production, which will

affect undisciplined suppliers; thirdly, a negative moral assessment will be made of the violators of planned assignments. Equally worthy of support is the system of special measures aimed at observing the nomenclatural contractual obligations, which has been increasingly used in recent years.

3

Incentive based on end results is steadily strengthening its positions in the national economy.

This is most clearly manifested in the broad economic experiment conducted by enterprises of the Ukrainian SSR ministries of Heavy Machine Building, Power and Electrification and Food Industry, the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Light Industry and the Lithuanian SSR Ministry of Local Industry, started in 1984. In the majority of cases these enterprises have been issued the same norms of increased wages per percentage of increased normative net output by ministry (commodity output for a number of enterprises). In an effort to increase their wage funds, the collectives must begin by "increasing" their net (commodity) output. The increased material incentive funds are based on increased profits (in machine building, on reducing production costs). In turn, this once again stimulates increases in the volumes of output, not to mention the interest in lowering specific production outlays while maintaining the same quantitative indicators. All of this has been reflected in the increased plans for output and reduced outlays per unit commodity. Thus, at the Elektrik Plant imeni N. M. Shvernika (Leningrad) the 1984 growth rates of labor productivity will be half again as high and profits will be increased by more than half a million rubles. At the Manometr PO the rates of growth of labor productivity for 1984 will be increased by more than 50 percent; they will more than double at the Dal'dizel' Plant (Khabarovsk). The increased volume of output at the Leather Combine imeni 60-Letiya Velikogo Okt'yabrya in Bobruysk will be 5.2 percent for 1984 rather than the previously planned 3.9 percent; labor productivity will increase by 5.8 percent instead of 4.5 percent as planned for that year.

Whereas before the experiment enterprises, whose volume of output either increased slowly or declined, showed no particular concern, now, when not merely a high percentage of plan implementation but its very level has become important, the situation has changed. The collectives are looking for reserves and are trying to renovate their output faster. A positive example in this respect is the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Light Industry, whose enterprises were able to reduce requests by trade enterprises for unsaleable goods by renovating variety.

Before the responsibility of the collectives for production results was increased they were granted broader rights in order to be able to effect them. For example, the number of indicators issued to the enterprises of the Ukrainian SSR Ministry of Food Industry in the annual plan was reduced severalfold. The conditions of the experiment on broadening the rights of industrial enterprises also stipulate rights which the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Light Industry and its enterprises may be granted to set temporary prices for experimental batches. Furthermore, the USSR State Committee for Prices is

conducting an experiment according to which a number of enterprises will set their own prices for new improved quality items.

The experiment, which is conducted at consumer service enterprises in the Bashkir and Komi ASSRs, Altay Kray and Astrakhan, Ivanovo, Kemerovo, Saratov and Yaroslavl oblasts, in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decree, also makes the increased wage fund dependent on increased marketing volume and the increased material incentive fund on increased profits. According to the experiment the collectives will keep the entire net profit and will be allowed independently to determine the amounts of funds channeled into production and social development. Naturally, the capital-labor ratio in consumer services is far lower than in heavy industry, for example, but it is steadily increasing. This growth must be supported by resources if the economy is to be managed efficiently. Making the solution of this problem the prerogative of enterprises means that in this area their production interest is quite strong and accurate.

The economic mechanism of the Food Program as well is based on bonuses to farm management personnel and specialists for every percent of increased profitability. Bonuses to managers and specialists in the rayon Sel'khoztekhnika, Sel'khozkhimiya and water resource organizations is based on increased agricultural output. Above-plan output was marketed at higher delivery prices until 1981, which placed in a better position the farms with reduced plans. Subsequently, goods produced over and above the average annual indicators for the preceding 5 years fetched higher prices. This encourages the best economic managers.

In noting the progressive nature of the conversion from bonuses for officially favorable percentages of implementing an insufficiently stressed plan to encouraging high end results as stipulated by the plan and actually obtained, we must not fail to mention a certain incompleteness in the orientation toward expressing achieved results in terms of growth. Such an approach, while stimulating growth, also puts in a better position collectives with low starting indicators and major unused reserves which make drastic increases possible. If the starting indicators are high and the reserves have been more or less defined, the further increase in growth results becomes increasingly difficult, for each subsequent percent of increased efficiency is achieved at a greater effort than the one preceding it. Therefore, collectives which have achieved the highest indicators and which essentially deserve the greatest rewards risk in this respect "to stop," and lose bonus possibilities. In order to maintain wages in such collectives on the necessary level, major investments must be made on a steady basis, which would "urge on" the growth base. However, adequate funds neither exist nor could exist for such investments. It would be expedient in the course of the experiment to try setting up wage and bonus funds based on uniform sectorial norms in accordance with the overall end results rather than part of the increase alone. This would be consistent with the inner logic of the further development of the already adopted new development.

Price markups for efficiency and quality (and discounts for the production of obsolete goods), used in the processing industry engaged in manufacturing



production tools are an example of encouraging high actual results. They differ and are not paid to all collectives which have fulfilled their plans but only to those which have achieved additional results from the produced goods. Markups are also added for the production of machine tools for export and so on. Another type of markup is allowing construction workers to use part of the customer profits which they were able to earn as a result of the ahead-of-schedule commissioning of one project or another. In this case a bonus for the "standard" is added to that of the "plan."

Markups for export, which the construction workers receive from the profits shown by the customer and the part of the material incentive funds created for fulfilling unionwide scientific and technical programs may be shared with the co-performers. Withholdings from the profits of customers are the main source of incentive funds of scientific production associations, scientific research institutes and design and technological organizations operating on the basis of a cost-accounting system of orders. The personnel of kolkhozes, sovkhozes and other agricultural enterprises are given bonuses from material incentive funds of processing enterprises for increasing the volume and improving the quality of deliveries.

The subunits of the Machine Building Production Association iment M. V. Frunze in Sumy, more than 100 enterprises of the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building and more than 100 enterprises in Sumy Oblast had their work assessed on the basis of actual results. This experience has been included in the experimental state standard for management and applied at nearly 300 base enterprises of 27 industrial ministries.

The earnings of members of cost-accounting brigades are determined by the actual number of houses built, assemblies produced and so on. Furthermore, they are also paid a certain percentage of the value of conserved material resources. Under the conditions of the brigade contracting system, for example, such payments include up to 60 percent for saving on materials, structures and parts, up to 40 percent for savings in the operation of construction materials and invoiced expenditures, up to 50 percent in the manufacturing of building structures and parts and up to 60 percent of savings achieved in the trucking of construction freight.

Consequently, the greater and more economical the output becomes the more brigade earnings rise. This stimulates the brigades to adopt intensive plans. Unfortunately, the work of the economic units superior to the brigades (as well as to other intraplant subunits) is assessed according to the old system--by the "plan." The unity between the primary and basic cost-accounting units is violated by the different assessment criteria used, which are not differentiated in terms of the degree of unification (in distinctions are necessary) but are essentially noncomparable. Thus, in the case of construction trusts the SMO are oriented both toward commissioning and "gross output" (for wages, category of enterprise, salaries to managerial personnel, etc.), rather than commissioning only, as is the case of contracting brigades. In order to eliminate all differences in assessing the activities of the various economic management units, for example, the Mobile Mechanized Column No 96 of the Main Moscow Oblast Construction Administration

set up a unified council in which the brigades, the engineering and technical personnel and the public organizations are represented. The personnel of the mobile mechanized columns and the line engineers are now receiving wage supplements from the general brigade bonus fund.

The principles of the economic mechanism apply equally to the entire national economy. For if excessively different management systems would be applied to different sectors, their coordination would be impossible, which would hinder the establishment of a monolithic economic organism. The excessive differentiation of economic mechanisms in terms of management levels, national economic sectors, subsectors, ministries, departments, territories and even individual enterprises, which had developed in the past, in terms of methods and norms of planning, incentives, price setting, financing, crediting, procurements, various wage supplements and bonuses for basic and other types of activities and mandatory conditions and ceilings of bonuses, which as now become unnecessary, has still not been eliminated to the necessary extent.

The time has come to enhance the role of the features shared by the different economic mechanisms to a level which would ensure their full coordination and synchronization, without abandoning the truly necessary specific features. The more qualitatively and efficiently the entire work on improving the economic mechanism as a whole, strengthening economic levers and, in particular, stimulating intensive plans is carried out, the more successfully the most important socioeconomic problems which our society is confronting today will be resolved.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

INCREASING ROLE OF WORKERS IN DEVELOPING PRODUCTION AND MANAGEMENT:  
STATEMENTS BY LENINGRAD BRIGADE LEADERS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 60-69

[Text] The search for, study and application of the most efficient brigade forms of labor organization is one of the most important tasks of party committees and all party members in production collectives. Its significance is determined by the fact that the conscientious and concerned attitude toward the work on the part of every working person and his concern for the results of collective labor determine the successes achieved in all production sectors and the national economy as a whole. As Comrade K. U. Chernenko, CPSU Central Committee general secretary, said at his meeting with the voters, improving the economic management system "is not reduced in the least to eliminating shortcomings in the activities of so-called official managers. Something else is equally important: to organize matters in such a way that the initiative and creativity of the broadest possible toiling masses be revealed in all their fruitfulness and power."

The party highly values the initiative of the working people and the collective intelligence and experience of the masses. As was emphasized at the February 1984 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, all major achievements in our economy are the result of the creative initiatives of labor collectives and their own counterplans.

The people of Leningrad recently launched a new initiative: to ensure the full increase in the volume of output through technical progress and maximal loading of the equipment and conservation of resources. This constitutes a further development of mass competition under the slogan "From High Quality Work of Everyone to High Efficiency of Collective Labor!"

The Leningrad party members relate the implementation of the objectives of the new initiative to the use of highly efficient and low-waste technologies, the fuller mechanization and automation of labor processes and improvements in economic management and the use of brigade labor methods which will not only interest the working people in steadily increasing labor productivity and high production quality but will directly involve them in production management.

Starting with the very first five-year plans the country paid great attention to the development of creative worker initiative. In 1930 the collective of the Leningrad Plant imeni Karl Marks initiated the formulation of a counter-industrial-financial plan. The first to use the word "counter" was S. M. Kirov, the leader of the Leningrad bolsheviks.

The following brigade leaders in three large production associations described to the KOMMUNIST correspondent the way they develop new brigade methods and strengthen labor collectives.

Hero of Socialist Labor G. Kononov, Brigade Leader at the Leningrad Machine Building Association imeni Karl Marks: We Are Optimistically Looking Ahead

I was born in Leningrad in 1932 and, metaphorically speaking, my early years were illuminated by the words and melodies of the beautiful song "On the Counter [Plan]" and by a certain special spirit and mood which prevailed at that time. My father was a casting worker precisely at the Plant imeni Karl Marks, where this noted initiative was developed. I well remember the discussions he held with his friends regarding the counterplan, the hot breath of smelting furnaces, which my father brought with him from the plant and his callused hands, which could so tenderly caress me and my sister.

My childhood came to an end early. The stern rhythm of the march in Shostakovich's Seventh Symphony suppressed the light and happy melody of the song "On the Counter [Plan]." My father went to the front and died defending Leningrad. We were evacuated to Verbovka village, Omsk Oblast. Back in Leningrad, I immediately entered a craft school and, at the age of 16, became a turner.

Since then I have steadily worked at my plant except for the period of my army service. Also employed at the plant as an assembly worker is my wife Raisa Anatol'yevna, while my daughter Irina is a computer operator at the design bureau. My son Tolya is still in school but he too, I believe, will follow in our footsteps.

Our plant has long specialized in machines for the textile industry. It was only during the war that, as was the case with many other enterprises, it converted to the manufacturing of mortars, "katyushas." During the 1950s we began to master the production of machines for the manufacturing of chemical fibers. Our shop was made experimental. We were supplied with entirely new and unfamiliar parts and assemblies and, after mastering their production, sent them down the line, supplying recommendations and processing methods.

At that time the turners worked alone and Nikolay Yevdokimov and I decided to work on the same machine tool in alternating shifts and to share our earnings. At that time there was not even a question of working on the basis of a single order so that we developed this method intuitively, as they say. Although there were only the two of us, this represented a small brigade.

In 1960 all turners in the shop united within a single brigade although everyone worked for himself. Everyone kept his own cutters and tools. Seven years ago, when it became a question of working on the basis of a single order, by no means everyone welcomed the idea.

The organization of new-type brigades was preceded by preparatory work not only by the administration and the engineering and technical services but by the party committee and the other social organizations and groups of scientific associates of the Leningrad Financial-Economic Institute imeni N. A.



Voznesenskiy. A program entitled "Improving the Organization of Labor and the Structure of Production Management on the Basis of Technical-Economic and Sociological Studies of Collective Forms of Labor Organization" was drafted through joint efforts. Method recommendations were issued on planning programmed changes in the nature and content of labor; the socioeconomic efficiency of the brigade organization of labor was determined after cost-accounting was introduced in all the links along the production chain.

Although all this may sound complex and scientific, its essence is simple: by applying the brigade forms of labor organization we tried to combine organizational, economic and social factors. Studies revealed that the social factor was being essentially ignored before the new-type brigade was organized. After the brigades had converted to a single order and the brigade councils began to compute wages based on the coefficient of labor participation, this factor gained real strength. It immediately became clear that there was no equalization within the brigade and that only those who worked sluggishly or violated the discipline suffered.

Our brigade began to work on the basis of a single order starting with January 1980. In addition to myself, it includes turners N. Yevdokimov, Yu. Ivanov, M. Tsyganok, I. Shcherbakov and S. Fomkin and grinder R. Marchenko. On the surface everything looked the same: the same machine tools, the same two shifts and the same people. However, the people's attitude toward the work changed for the better and so did interrelationships.

For example, the turner is no longer concerned with whether machining a given part is profitable or unprofitable, for our work is based on end results. It became possible to assign to one worker or another more customary and suitable work which would increase his output. At the end of the shift he would turn over his lathe to the next shift without the need for stopping or re-tuning. This substantially improved the equipment shift coefficient and the output and quality of the parts.

Everything became common property: machine tools, instruments, cutters and, above all, experience! If so needed, everyone was ready to help to set up a lathe and demonstrate how to machine a part better and faster. In the past as well we helped the young or the laggards but far less than now. Now everyone is profoundly interested in the faster and better quality output of every brigade member.

As you may have noted, the brigade includes a grinding worker who cleans up the parts we machine. Whereas in the past some workers may have left a greater tolerance than necessary, although still within the norm, now we try to machine the parts with a minimal tolerance, so that the grinding worker will find it easier to process them, for the end result of the brigade's work depends on him as well.

Defining the labor participation coefficient (KTU) has a substantial influence on production output and the growth of labor productivity. We discovered that the very discussion of their KTU has an influence on the workers. We determine this coefficient at the monthly brigade council meeting. Since our brigade is small, all workers participate in the discussion.

We must point out that determining the size of wages with the help of the KTU is one of the bottlenecks in the development of brigade forms of labor organization. This cannot be achieved by issuing directives or stern orders. The worker has the right to refuse to work within such a brigade. Therefore, in order to use computations based on the coefficient of labor participation extensive explanatory work is needed, in the course of which we cannot do without the help of the party organization, the trade union and the Komsomol.

As chairman of the council of brigade leaders in Vyborgskiy Rayon, I am well familiar with the complexity of maintaining the new types of brigades. At one of the plenums of the Leningrad City Party Committee, of which I am a member, I suggested that the enterprise party committees set up commissions for the application of brigade forms of labor organization. Such a commission was set up in our association as well.

As a result of the joint efforts of the party committee and the management, the use of brigade methods of labor organization in our association increased from 46.1 percent in 1981 to 57.9 percent at the beginning of this year. The figures on wages based on the labor participation coefficient are even more striking: within the same period they increased from 9 to 55.4 percent. The situation relative to the number of brigades working on the basis of end results is somewhat worse: in 2 years they increased from 5.6 to 17.5 percent. Yet the share of brigades working on the basis of a single order increased from 37.2 to 52.5 percent of their overall number in our association.

Naturally, such data do not indicate that everything related to the development of brigade forms in the association is as it should be and that no support is needed, for the method itself is making its way. Allow me to express a few remarks on problems related to further brigade progress.

The traditional management methods in the shops do not always contribute to the efficient interaction among production brigades. In some cases they are unfamiliar with the mechanism used in formulating the planned assignment and the extent to which its implementation has material support. Under the current shop management organization, the brigade leader does not have the possibility of obtaining the necessary information. The point is that in our association the position of the brigade within the shop management structure has not been clearly defined and there is no firm assignment of obligations to shop service personnel in terms of the brigades. In my view, organizational steps should be taken in this area.

Enhancing the overall level of labor and management organization in the shop would enable us to ensure the autonomy of the brigades as the primary production collectives within the limits of allocated manpower, material and financial resources and to increase their role and rights in resolving a number of problems, such as the fuller and more sensible use of working time and equipment, mastering and combining related skills, introducing multiple-machine servicing and strengthening planning, production and labor discipline and conserving material resources, electric power and fuel.

Naturally, the problems related to the further development of brigade forms do not affect us alone and I believe that through the joint efforts of

workers, brigade councils and brigade leader councils, with the help of engineering and technical personnel and ministry specialists and scientists dealing with production management problems, we shall be able to resolve them as well in the not-so-distant future.

Our achievements during the past few years allow us to look ahead with optimism. The advantages of the brigade of a new type are obvious. This can be clearly seen in our brigade and in dozens and hundreds of brigades in Vyborgskiy Rayon and throughout Leningrad. Thus, following the conversion to the new method, we have been systematically outstripping the planned rates of growth of labor productivity. We are increasing labor productivity by an annual average of 12-13 percent. It was precisely this which enabled us to fulfill our five-year plan by 4 March, the day of elections for the USSR Supreme Soviet.

V. Berezin, Head of a Comprehensive Brigade at the Izhorskiy Zavod imeni A. A. Zhdanov Association: We Are Keeping Our Word As Workers

Our plant, which was founded in 1722, is one of the oldest in Leningrad. In the past it supplied the capital city on the Neva with timber and bricks, then anchors and copper sheets; today it is manufacturing equipment for nuclear electric power plants, excavators and a great variety of other items.

The shop in which I work machines semifinished shafts and rotors for large turbines and generators. Our shop is the only one of its kind in the country to produce such items which are unique in terms of complexity of shape, weight and dimensions. Also unique is the equipment used. Thus, the lathes can machine shafts which could be 24 meters long and weigh as much as 250 tons.

When I joined this shop it seemed to me, a turner with great experience (I had previously worked in Kimry and Leningrad), that I would never dare to come near those giants. However, after graduating from a technical night school and working as foreman and senior engineer-technologist, I became accustomed to that scale and my timidity disappeared in 1973, when I was entrusted with one such lathe.

For a long time the lathes were handled in two shifts by small brigades consisting of two or three persons. One turner replaced another. We were short of assistants. The crane was handled by those who were more thorough in removing the shavings and those who were lucky, while the fitter or the electrician had to be harnessed to eliminate malfunctions in the lathe. This was to the detriment of the workers, the shop and the entire association. At the end of the evening shift one unwittingly sighed: How could such a machine be idle throughout the night!

We also frequently fell behind in supplying parts for the subsequent operation. Meanwhile, assignments kept increasing. The 1981 results proved that we would be unable to fulfill our five-year plan the way we worked, and would thus delay the completion of priority power industry construction projects in the country.

After discussing the situation, the party members in the sector reached the conclusion that the only solution was the creation of comprehensive brigades which would work on a three-shift basis. This was a new and exceptionally difficult project. We were short of cadres for staffing the brigades. Furthermore, many people were unwilling to work the night shift. The brigade recruited young people and trained them for this highly responsible work. All of this took almost 6 months.

Finally, on 1 June 1982 we began operations as a comprehensive brigade which, in addition to 23 turners, included fitters-repairmen, electricians, fastening workers, one tool sharpener and crane operators--a total of 35 people; all of whom began to work on the basis of a single order and to operate five machine tools.

The equipment shift coefficient increased not only as a result of introducing a third shift but also of replacing turners who may be sick or on leave. In the past, in such cases the machine tools idled. The brigade coefficient increased from 1.6 to 2.6; in other words, the machine tools do not idle but work virtually around the clock. They are stopped only for retuning or other necessary technical reasons. The establishment of a comprehensive brigade enabled us to increase labor productivity so drastically that early as 16 September 1982, i.e., 3.5 months after its establishment, we reported the implementation of the annual plan. Nevertheless, not everything went smoothly that year; there were even violations of the labor discipline, such as tardiness and absenteeism. We were able to reeducate some of the workers but had to dismiss two members.

The association's party committee and management paid daily attention to us. They literally fostered and nurtured the new brigade on which so many hopes for the future depended. Aware of this steady concern and aid, we, the brigade members, tried to justify this trust and to prove that we could apply new, higher standards in our work.

We set up a brigade party group in 1983. Until then the party members were registered with the section's party group. Today our primary party organization has 11 members and two candidate members of the CPSU, whom we trained for joining the party after the brigade was created. Turner Yu. Lebedev, my deputy, was appointed party group organizer. The party group began to provide effective aid to the brigade council. It energized the life of the new collective as a whole and of every individual worker.

The party group and the brigade council paid particular attention to the training of the young workers and to developing in them a feeling of responsibility for their own work and for the common brigade project. The best tutors of the young people are sixth-grade turners Yu. Lebedev and A. Aksyutin and fifth-grade turners Ye. Petrov, V. Zabavin and A. Chugunov. Under their guidance our "new recruits" Yu. Yevpak, A. Vinogradov and A. Tokarev, who are handling small machine tools, are turning into real specialists. Former assistants A. Titov, S. Mosin, A. Ryazanov, S. Romanov and V. and S. Ivanov are confidently mastering turner skills.



Naturally, the work of such a large number of people with different skills and experience, based on a single order, would have been impossible without the use of the labor participation coefficient. When I hear that here and there the KTU is not welcomed or is even opposed, I immediately realize that no explanatory work has been conducted among workers and even brigades leaders. In my view, had there been no KTU we would have had to invent and apply it, given the need for such a coefficient in determining the final amount of wages!

It is precisely the KTU which enables us to determine fully and accurately the real contribution of the individual worker to the common brigade project. What could happen otherwise? A person may have reached a high grade and have extensive seniority and experience yet be stumbling around in his job in the hope that his previous merits will be acknowledged and he will earn no less than those who work more energetically and conscientiously.

The objective assessment of individual labor, in which not only the grade of the worker and his skill are taken into consideration but also intangibles which are difficult to measure, such as enthusiasm, inspiration and mutual aid, embodied in end results, are important factors in production management and in terms of the brigade's cohesion and activities. It is precisely the rating of the brigade council and one's fellow workers that inspire everyone to look at oneself and his contribution to the common project more seriously. Here again it is not a question of higher or lower wages. What matters is that the brigade rating expresses the true attitude of the labor collective toward the individual. After receiving his latest KTU he develops a different, more exigent attitude toward the implementation of his obligations and his fellow brigade members.

Therefore, the allocation of wages based on the KTU has a direct impact on the growth of labor productivity and the shaping of the people as members of the labor collectives and citizens of a socialist society.

Let me point out that the specific nature of our output--the processing of shafts and rotors--and its complexity, importance and long service life makes it possible for every one of us to become better aware of the importance of our individual contribution to laying the material and technical foundations for communism. Indeed, we are not simply engaged in the manufacturing of any kind of parts, even though huge, but of the true core of a nuclear or hydraulic electric power plant, of whose construction the entire country has been made aware long before its completion.

Actually, there are no nuclear or hydroelectric power plants in the country which could do without our output. This includes the leading hydraulic power plants in Siberia on the Angara and Yenisey and the Obninsk nuclear power plant, the first of its kind in the world. Last year alone we manufactured the shafts and rotors for the Cheboksary, Tyuyamuyunskaya, Mayna and Shulbinskaya GES and the Khmel'nik and Rovno nuclear power plants; this year our output will go to the priority turbines of the Zaporoz'ye, South Ukrainian, Balakovo and Ignalina nuclear power plants and the Kozloduy nuclear electric power plant in Bulgaria.

However, these electric power plants, which are or will be generating current with the help of our output, trigger in us not only legitimate pride but a feeling of high responsibility for the quality of the manufacturing and the promptness of deliveries of such equipment.

The processing of technical documents for the various operations in a so-called brigade set, which contains clear stipulations relative to the material, machine tools and mechanisms needed for the manufacturing of one commodity or another and stipulates the precise deadlines for completion and the earnings of the brigade as a result of implementing its assignment, contributes to the efficient activities of comprehensive brigades. The brigade set depends not only on the available equipment but the skill and experience of the workers and the knowledge of the engineering and technical personnel. All of this helps to unify the efforts and to coordinate the activities of workers and specialists and the administration in the struggle for substantial end production results.

The councils of brigade leaders in shops, production lines and the association as a whole play a great part in planning the indicators of the brigade set. They help the administration in drafting schedules for the formulation and processing of the brigade set and the organization of brigade labor based on planning-accounting and payment units. Therefore, together with the people's control committee and the permanent production conferences, the brigade councils contribute to the efficiency with which the orders of the administration are carried out, improvements in the administrative apparatus and strengthening the one-man command principle as well as the increased participation of the workers in production control and management.

The creation of comprehensive brigades is an objective demand of the contemporary production process. Their advantage compared with the old methods is obvious even in our brigade. In the 18 months since the brigade was created, we were able to increase our volume of output by a factor of 1.6; labor productivity increased by 33 percent while wages increased by 14 percent. This enabled us to review previous obligations and led to a decision to fulfill the five-year plan in 3 years and 9 months and to produce above-plan goods worth 200,000 rubles in 1984.

Hero of Socialist Labor L. Cherepenin, Brigade Leader at the Kirishinefteorgsintez imeni 50-Letiya VLKSM Production Association: Brigade Leaders Hold a Working Position

Our petroleum refinery, which is part of the Kirishinefteorgsintez Production Association, is young. Construction of the refinery began in 1960 and I joined it in 1965.

As it flows along the pipes into the huge cisterns, the petroleum is warmed up and "cracks up" into gas, gasoline, naphtha, diesel oil and fuel oil. Our towers are tall and from afar remind one of spaceships pointing at outer space, and the complex equipment and meters of the control panels resemble those of spaceships. To some this comparison may seem far-fetched. As a former military pilot, however, I may be forgiven for this. Since childhood

I dreamed of the skies and was a member of the Yaroslavl Aeroclub. However, it so happened that after graduating from the Yeysk Air Force Academy I had to abandon the air force and be retrained for a strictly earthbound profession.

There have always been brigades in petroleum refining. This is due to the specifics of the production process which requires the efforts of an entire group of people. Until recently they followed the old method: everyone was responsible for himself and his own work and his wages were based on skill. There was no collective responsibility or interest in the final output. However, the quantity and quality of petroleum refining and the conservation of electric power, water, steam and chemical reagents largely depend on the coordinated efforts of all workers and machine operators which maintain the technological process in an optimal state.

It was 3 years ago that we made our first attempt to convert the brigade to work on the basis of the labor participation coefficient (KTU). We were visited by an associate of the laboratory for the scientific organization of labor, who described to us what to do and how. However, she had either prepared herself for her talk poorly or herself failed to understand the essence of the matter, the result was that she was unable to answer the specific questions asked by the workers.

Nevertheless, I realized that this was a progressive method to which the future belonged and tried to convince my comrades of the importance of applying the new form of labor organization and accounting. We even began to draw up tables and record data for a final computation of the labor participation coefficient. Although everything was done on an experimental basis and did not affect wages, strange though it might seem, the people's attitude toward this novelty was one of caution and even a certain mistrust. Why engage in unnecessary paperwork and meetings when no one knew what would come out of it? Things quieted down.

In recalling this, I once again realize how important the thorough and serious preparation, metaphorically speaking, the launching pad is in starting something new. If the obstacles are not removed on the way, no take-off run can be obtained and, therefore, there can be no take-off.

I would like to give proper credit to the Leningrad Party Obkom and the USSR Ministry of Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry, which showed persistence in organizing the brigades of a new type. Extensive work was done not only with the management of the production association but the brigade leaders and the workers as well. Finally, in 1983, the AT-1 systems brigade, followed by ours, converted to the new method based on end results and the labor participation coefficient.

In determining the basic labor participation coefficient, we take into consideration the educational level, work seniority, familiarity with block systems and several moral factors, such as labor conscientiousness, initiative, attentive attitude toward the equipment and others. Let me point out that computations based on the KTU affect only our bonuses. However, since

we receive a large number of bonuses, as a whole they affect basic earnings substantially.

Judge for yourselves, we earn monthly bonuses which run as high as 40 percent of the rate for plan fulfillment and quarterly bonuses for the production of export commodities and for the conservation of electric power, water, steam, ammonium solution and others. Bonuses are also paid for fulfilling the plan for steam production which we send to the TETs, and bonuses for winning the competition among shops. There also are ministerial bonuses for victory in the competition by sector or within the ministry. This makes for substantial amounts and the way the brigade council, together with the collective, will compute the labor participation coefficient does not leave anyone indifferent.

Our brigade council consists of nine members: myself, as the brigade leader, operators Yu. Antipov, M. Blinchikov, S. Kulakov, V. Okunev, S. Smirnov and Ye. Shuvalov and machine operators V. Kitayev and A. Savel'yev. The council works in close contact with the system's party group, which consists of 14 party members. Operator V. Ziberov was elected party bureau secretary.

The brigade council is a form of real participation of the workers in production management. It resolves important problems of our work. Our council did not develop in a vacuum. It functioned embryonically even before its official establishment, for any collective has an aktiv which rallies around the party organization and is in the vanguard of the struggle for resolving problems.

Thus, as early as 1974 the brigade aktiv launched the initiative of working without violations of technological, production and labor discipline. Some considered this to be impossible. At first this was indeed the situation. However, the initiative yielded good results: during the past 7 years we have not had a single labor discipline violation.

In 1976 our brigade decided to double the length of operation of the equipment between repairs. This was easily said but the project was extraordinarily difficult. The blocks of our system are under steady load and high pressure and work at high temperatures. Therefore, the condition of furnaces, boilers, blocks, pipes and other equipment has to be supervised closely.

Some people described our initiative as a risky undertaking: "You are playing with fire," I was told. But then, in for a penny, in for a pound. We began and a year passed. Under ordinary conditions we were scheduled to repair the equipment. However, we went on working. Naturally, we were excited and concerned and watched particularly closely the condition of the equipment, the temperature and the pressure in the blocks. Two years passed without stopping for equipment repairs. The results were pleasing. A thorough study of the condition of the equipment during repairs indicated that it had retained its strength. Encouraged by the results, we started another 2-year run. In August 1983 we began a fourth such cycle which had become customary for us.

Our system's output is high every working hour. Our brigade supplies the country also not with an hour's or 24 hours' but an entire month's worth of work (this is exactly the amount of time needed for repairs). As a result



we have drastically increased the production of finished goods. Labor productivity has increased as well. The brigade developed followers not only in our association but at other enterprises in the country as well.

At this point, when I am asked whether the workers can indeed participate in production management, I always cite this and other examples which clearly prove the extent to which management improvements depend on the workers.

Someone once objected to me, saying that it is not the workers themselves but the brigade leaders who make the decision, for the workers only obey their instructions. I answered that the Soviet working class has proved its ability to manage both production and the state. Let us also bear in mind that it is a question of the educational level, skill and culture of the workers. In our brigade, for example, many of the operators have acquired higher specialized education. They are graduates of institutes in Moscow and other cities. Incidentally, all VUZ graduates in our enterprise begin in worker positions, such as control panel operators, and only after they have become properly familiar with the operation of all blocks in the system do they become engineering and technical personnel, for this is not a matter of training alone.

The main thing is that the brigade leader, who has power over a small collective, will never make an important basic decision without discussing it in the brigade council to which workers are elected. However, once the decision has been made the brigade leader's instruction becomes law. Who can say that we do not manage production when we, brigade leaders, are entrusted with a tremendous system costing many millions of rubles? The production process is entirely in the hands of the workers for an entire shift, the night shift in particular, when the plant has only one engineering and technical worker on duty--the dispatcher! This does not apply to something small but entire systems and, actually, the entire plant is entirely managed by workers! Incidentally, being a brigade leader is a worker job and it is regrettable that not everyone is aware of this.

Recently our association passed a decision on the further development of the brigade form of labor organization. What does it consist of? Each system has five brigades which replace each other according to a special schedule. It was resolved to convert them into shifts and unite them within a single new brigade. The volume of output will be computed for 24 hours and shared by the shifts.

The specifics of petroleum refining is such that it is difficult to compute precisely the output of one brigade or another, for several hours after a shift has been completed the brigade operating at that time will be still benefitting from the results of the brigade which preceded it. The same occurs when the next shift takes over. Therefore, we shall not simply increase the size of the brigade fivefold but will combine the efforts of all shifts in which each shift will be interested in the quality and efficiency of the work done not only by its own personnel but its colleagues in the other shifts.

The reorganization of the brigades will require even more impeccable performance obligations, broadening the areas of servicing and combination of skills and further improvements in labor organization, so that with the installation of new large production facilities the number of the staff will not increase. In combination with the reconstruction of the existing systems and production automation, all of this will enable us to reach the planned capacity of the enterprise and improve the growth rates of labor productivity and production quality.

In terms of the growth of labor productivity, the association has reached the levels set for the 11th Five-Year Plan; in terms of the production of superior quality items it has exceeded that limit. The collective was awarded the Red Challenge Banner of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Council of Ministers, AUCCTU and Komsomol Central Committee for victory in the all-union socialist competition. This award inspires us to new labor successes.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

#### EXCERPT CONTINUED

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 70-81

[Article by V. Barayev, Moscow-Ust-Kut-Tynda-Blagoveshchensk-Khabarovsk-Nikolayevsk-na-Amure]

[Text] "...Paying attention to the past could illuminate our future...." --I. Yakushkin

In the early hours of a January morning we left Ust-Kut for Zvezdnyy and were able to see from a distance the powdery snow-covered bridge across the Lena. Under the rays of a blinding sun, in the transparent air crackling with frost, it looked light and brittle, as though made of crystal. From a closer distance, naturally, it looked different. Powerful stone piers and reinforced concrete girders sturdily linked the banks of the great river, opening the way for a new rushing of the Baykal-Amur Mainline. The journalists had somewhat thoughtlessly named it a bridge to the future; to me it was a bridge to the past. The point is that dipping into the prehistory of the BAM (Baykal-Amur Mainline), in the 1930s, the building of the Trans-Siberian and the mid-19th century, when people began talking about railroads, I once again "went" to the Decembrists, who were the first to discuss new ways of communications in Siberia.

Having resolved to find out who among them had crossed the area where the bridge across the Lena stood, I found out that V. Shcheyngel' had been here as early as 1784. Vladimir Ivanovich was one of the few Decembrists who had grown up in Siberia. At that time the road to Kamchatka followed along the Lena. In 1824 it was crossed by D. Zavalishin, on his return from California via Orel, Irkutsk and Irkutsk to Petersburg. In the course of his long round-the-world trip he drew up a plan for the development of Amur and Sakhalin. At different times Ust-Kut was also crossed by A. Bestuzhev-Marlinskiy, N. Borishchev-Peshkin, N. Zaikin and N. Chizhov, who had been exiled to Yakutia. The only Decembrist who crossed the eastern sector of the BAM in the area of today's Komsomolsk-na-Amure turned out to be M. Bestuzhev, who crossed the river here in 1857 and 1858. All of these people did not simply travel and cross the river but made a great contribution to the development of the economy and culture of a once-forgotten area.

Nikolay Bestuzhev was one of the first to describe the Gusinozerskoye coal deposit site. He conducted seismological and meteorological observations and collected Buryat songs and tales. His brother Mikhail invented and manufactured carriages which became popular throughout the district. He worked on

acclimatizing plants and participated in the publication of the first Transbaykal newspaper KYAKHTINSKIY LISTOK. Many among the Decembrists engaged in teaching and practiced medicine and law without charge.

Nevertheless, the role which the Decembrists played in the development of Siberia has not been studied fully. The point is not only that they were exiled in its various corners but the variety of their activities. Academician M. V. Nechkin points out that many aspects of the scientific topic "The Decembrists and Siberia," on which hundreds of books and thousands of articles and essays have been written, needs more research. Particularly promising is research which exceeds the limits of ordinary geographic and temporal limitations. In describing the life and activities of the Decembrists we must not be limited to their stay in Siberia until the 1856 amnesty, for some of them lived there through the end of the 1860s.

The future Decembrists had paid attention to the Far East long before the uprising. Their views covered a complex path from mystical masonic lodges to secret societies with a clearly defined political program. A. N. and N. N. Murav'yev organized the Choka Youth Fraternity in 1811. Under the influence of Rousseau's ideas on the social contract, they decided to establish a republic, an ideal state in Sakhalin. A curious parallel to this idea was A. Pushkin's concept as mentioned by the noted historian N. Eydel'man: one of the poet's last works dedicated to P. Krasheninnikov discussed an original free Cossack "republic" which had existed at the beginning of the 18th century in Kamchatka.

At the beginning of the 1820s in their plan for reorganization the Decembrists M. Orlov and M. Dmitriyev-Mamonov, with the participation of N. Turgenev, were contemplating the building of harbors at the estuary of the Amur. After becoming head of office of the Russian-American Company in 1824, K. Ryleyev personally dealt with problems of developing Russian-American relations and the Far East. While working for the company, Ryleyev procured quite practical suggestions submitted by various individuals relative to the study of the area. Had he not been detained and executed, he would probably have dedicated all his strength to the implementation of the plans which Decembrists D. Zavalishin and V. Romanov had drafted on the development of the Amur area and the North.

A note by P. Pestel' entitled "Opening Maritime Trade Around the Cape of Good Hope between Russia, China, Japan and the Philippine Islands..." has been preserved. In RUSSKAYA PRAVDA he suggested a new administrative division of Russia after the defeat of autocracy. The maps attached to it zone in detail the area of Siberia east of which Irkutsk, Yakutsk and Kamchatka districts were to be created. In less detail but with greater consideration for natural and economic features of the various parts of the country, Russia was divided in Nikita Murav'yev's constitutional draft. These notes were developed in his fundamental work "On Communications in Russia," which was written during the period of his Siberian exile.

In 1819 C. Vasilevskiy, who was a close friend of the Bestuzhev family, advised N. Bestuzhev to seek in the archives "whether" the Great was not



planning something on the Amur." Nikolay Aleksandrovich, who had been appointed the admiralty's historiographer, began his fundamental work "Historical Experience of the Russian Navy," in which he described in detail not only the activities of Peter the Great but also the very first expeditions of daring Russian travelers.

"...The Arctic Sea and part of the Eastern Ocean became familiar to the Russians from the north with the help of the enterprising Dezhnev, a name which will remain unforgotten in the chronicles of discoveries," N. Bestuzhev wrote. "...Following the northern expeditions to Yakutsk news was brought about the Amur River by the Tomsk Cossacks.... This news...resulted in sending to the Yakut Voyerod Golovin a detachment formally commanded by Vasilii Poyarkov, on 15 July 1643, to make a thorough study of the areas adjacent to the Amur." The Decembrist then described in detail Poyarkov's sailing trip.

N. Bestuzhev's great work remained incomplete: his detention and exile interrupted his activities. Unquestionably, he would have described in as much detail the further development of the Far East. A new and shorter way to the Amur opened with the Russian crossing of the Baykal in 1648 (Poyarkov and Khabarov reached it from Yakutia). The Nerchinskiy stockade was founded in 1654 and the Albazinskiy stockade in 1665.

The local tribes--the Gol'd (Nanay), Evenk, Gilyak (Nivkh) and others were suffering from Manchurian raids which restricted them in all possible ways. In 1655 the Evenk Prince Gantimur, together with his entire tribe, to use a modern term, "accepted Russian citizenship." This expression of friendship toward Russia was not liked by the Manchurian Qing dynasty which, after seizing the power in China (1644) launched an aggressive policy toward the peoples along the Amur and Russia. In 1670 Emperor Kanxi demanded Gantimur's surrender. However, D. Arshinskiy, the Nerchin voyevod, refused to do so. Having found a convenient pretext, the Manchurians mounted a campaign along the Zeya and Selezmdzha where they destroyed the Russian settlements; starting with 1685 they began to invade the upper reaches of the Amur, repeatedly storming Albazin. Thus, the Qing empire seized, as admitted by 19th-century Chinese historian He Kiutao, foreign lands "which had never before belonged to China."

Years went by. Russia repeatedly showed its good will toward China. A number of diplomatic and trade caravans visited Beijing. A Russian spiritual mission was founded there in 1715, which actually played the part of an embassy. Mutually profitable Russian-Chinese trade was resumed in 1728 through Kyakhta. Relations between the two countries were very good. When the British launched their cruel colonial war on China in the middle of the 19th century, the fact could not fail to concern Russia, the more so since British ships began to sail toward the estuary of the Amur and the shores of Sakhalin and Kamchatka.

The Crimean campaign was launched in 1853. British, French and Turkish troops laid siege to Sevastopol. A fleet commanded by Adm D. Price sailed toward the Far Eastern shores of Russia. In order to protect the Pacific

Coast, M. Murav'yev, the governor-general of Eastern Siberia, decided to move troops via the Amur.

At that time the Amur expedition headed by G. Nevel'skiy, which had been studying the lower reaches of the Amur and Sakhalin since 1849, and had been the first to determine that the island was not connected to the continent with an isthmus, as had been claimed by Laperouse, Krusenstern and other navigators, was successfully completing its work. The Decembrists joyfully welcomed the successes of the expedition. N. Bestuzhev wrote that "I was cheered by the good news of the great accomplishments of our seamen. However, the horizon is darkening. I do not know whether we would be able to deal with the English...but I would very much like for our side to thrash these treacherous islanders for their base policies throughout the world...."

The first sailing on the Amur was successful. The troops and armaments were delivered in Kamchatka at a perfect time. When Admiral Price's launched its attack on Petropavlovsk, the resistance was so strong that, after losing the admiral himself and hundreds of seamen, the fleet sailed away from the Russian shores.

In September 1854, again through the Ayan and Yakutsk, a group of seamen commanded by Adm Ye. Putyatin reached Irkutsk. "The discussion on the outcome of the Amur expedition," S. Volkonskiy wrote to I. Pushchin, "on the equipment and the type of new expedition to be launched along the Amur and details and plans for Putyatin's sailing expedition and everything relative to our riverway, from the estuary of the Amur to Emperor's Harbor, are so entertaining and soothing to the Russian heart...."

Nicholas I died in 1855. It seemed as though a fresh wind had begun to blow after 30 years of imperial rule maintained with the help of guns and gallows. The first scientific edition of the works of A. S. Pushkin came out; Foreign Affairs Minister Nessel'rode was dismissed (replaced by A. Gorchakov, who was the schoolmate of Pushkin, Pushchin and Kyukhel'beker). The Decembrists were amnestied. At that time Mikhail, the son of Decembrist S. Volkonskiy, was in Moscow and it took him only 15 days to reach Irkutsk with the news of the amnesty! However, three-quarters of the Decembrists did not live to see their liberation. They died and were buried in Siberia and the Caucasus.

Regular sailing on the Amur was organized after 1854. This was helped by the major diplomatic efforts made by N. Murav'yev and his assistants. Engels wrote that, having decided to seek revenge for its defeat in the Crimean War, Russia "chose an area in which it had no rivals--diplomacy" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 17, p 638).

Anglo-French forces landed in the south of China in 1856, initiating a new intervention. With increasing frequency foreign ships began to approach the estuary of the Amur. Governor-General N. Murav'yev and his retinue argued "with the Chinese government that friendship and alliance with us is stronger and more useful to them than with any other country and that, conversely, hostility toward us is totally fatal..."

Such were the circumstances in which M. A. Bestuzhev was instructed to undertake his next sailing expedition in 1857. Let us point out that the governor-general respected the Decembrists, took their views into consideration and issued them responsible assignments.

He had an important conversation with Mikhail Bestuzhev prior to the latter's departure from Irkutsk. After Murav'yev spoke of the importance of Nikolayevsk-na-Amure as a transshipment base on the way to Petropavlovsk, which he wanted to make the capital of the Far East, Bestuzhev undertook to prove to him that Nikolayevsk will never be of any importance as a commercial or military port and that the Russian fleet should be based more to the south. "Is it for nothing that the Amur has taken us to the ocean, for the sake of idly admiring behind the ice and snowstorms on its estuary the commercial activities of other nations?" He then said that if we would like to have a fleet there we need not icebergs and closed harbors but a convenient, open port in the south.

The Decembrist's viewpoint amazingly coincides with the view expressed on this account by Hertzén, who wrote in "Past and Thoughts:" "...The Pacific is the Mediterranean of the future. In this future the role of Siberia, a country between the ocean, southern Asia and Russia, will be exceptionally important." Hertzén also said that it is the southern parts of Siberia that should be developed. What was the worth of "freezing and shivering in Berezovo and Yakutsk, when there were Krasnoyarsk, Minusinsk and others?"

Bestuzhev was exceedingly pleased by the possibility of coming out of the lethargic slumber in which he had been forced to spend many years. The Decembrist decided "to plant along the entire Amur, every time we set up camp for the night, one of the best species of Vladimir cherries and, in the course of time, when this splendid Amur alley could grow, future generations of young sailors, sailing along the Amur to serve in the future Sevastopol on the Pacific Ocean, will relax under their shade..., as an unforgotten glory of the three admirals and their teacher, who died at Sevastopol (N. Bestuzhev was the instructor of P. Nakhimov, V. Kornilov and V. Istomin at the Navy Corps--the author), a glory which will instill in their hearts the noble resolve to emulate such lofty models; they will be grateful to the old sailor who had planted these trees."

The trip turned out to be exceptionally complex and difficult. The Irkutsk merchants Zimin and Serebrennikov, who had set up the "First Amur Company" for the delivery of government freight, were unable to prepare the shipment and the entire burden in organizing and conducting the trip was assumed by M. Bestuzhev.

As he sailed by Nerchinsk, Bestuzhev remembered M. Lunin, who had died not far from Akatuye, during his second jail term. It was no accident that he described Nerchinsk as Dante's city of sorrow "in which the air seemed infused with the sighing of the miserable and the soil is moist with bloody sweat and tears." However, in his letters and diary he kept during the Baykal-Amur odyssey, he painted a broad canvas of the development of the Amur. The banks of the Ingoda at Chita reminded him of "Kronshtadt in spring. Rafts are

strung along the shore for a couple of versts: fussing and shouting everywhere." In the Ust-Zeya area "it is like a real Tower of Babel: Poles, Votyaks, Tatars, Jews, etc., etc."

The traffic on the Amur was quite lively. On the way Bestuzhev met with I. Furugel'm, chief of the Ayansk port, the merchants K. Kandinskiy and I. Pargachevskiy, the American commercial agent P. McCollins, who had requested permission to build a railroad between Selenga and Amur and the noted travelers M. Venyukov and G. Radde.

In his letter from the village of Ust-Zeyskoy (today the city of Blagoveshchensk), M. Bestuzhev wrote that "the village will become the main stronghold of the settlement. Twenty-five homes or cottages have already been built,...25 are halfway ready and in 1 month another 25 will stretch along a line more than 8 versts long...."

Bestuzhev saw that the Amur natives were friendly toward the Russians. "...The simple people, particularly in Aygun, are already convinced...that the (Russians) are settling in Zeya so that through joint efforts they could defeat the Ingri (the English) should they try to raze Aygun." Bestuzhev's stop in Ust-Zeya coincided with the arrival in Aygun of the Beijing ambassador. Governor-General N. Murav'yev asked Bestuzhev to help organize a friendly reception and the latter gave "everything he had on that occasion."

The sailors were particularly warmly welcomed by the local tribes in the lower reaches of the Amur. As early as 1850 the Gilyaks (Nivkh) had welcomed G. Nevel'skiy most warmly. It was at that time that the Negidals and Samogirs turned to him with the demand for protection by the Russians from the Manchurians. Bestuzhev saw on a rock at the Tyr settlement, on the right bank of the Amur, stone pillars on which the dates 1649 and 1665 had been cut out in Church Slavonic figures and the year 1850 in Arabic figures. The first dates had been cut out by a Russian after Poyarkov and Khabarov and the latter by G. Nevel'skiy. The Gilyaks were sacredly protecting these pillars and preventing Manchurian merchants from throwing them into the river.

Bestuzhev's caravan did not reach Nikolayevsk until the autumn. "Finally, after a hard, delayed and painful sailing or, more accurately, walking on the bottom of the Amur, I reached the very end of our vast homeland," Bestuzhev wrote on 16 September 1857. However eager he was to return home to Selenginsk, he was forced to settle for the winter....

His last letters speak of Adm P. Kravkevich, the first governor of the Maritime Oblast and the commander of the Siberian fleet. He was a comrade-in-arms of Nevel'skiy and had sailed to America, Kamchatka, the Kuril Islands and Sakhalin. He was one of the first to sail down and up the Amur and to lay the first Transbaykal wharf in Svoyensk.

"The terrible scurvy which was so horrifying at first has been defeated by our concerned admiral.... The people are healthy, cheerful and happy. They are well-clothed and well-fed. That is why there is active work everywhere, houses are springing up like mushrooms, ships are being built, steamers are



being assembled and excellent machine shops are being organized.... It is regrettable that Nikolayevsk, as the administrative center, is not located here..."

The importance of the initial trips along the Amur, one of which was made by the Decembrist M. Bestuzhev, is tremendous. Thanks to them Russia and China avoided a British intervention in the Far East; the situation of the small nationalities along the Amur improved. The peaceful development of the Amur contributed to the rapprochement between the Russian and Chinese people.

Russo-Chinese treaties (Aigong, Tianjing, Beijing) were concluded in 1858-1860, establishing the boundary line along the Amur and the Ussuri.

The peoples of Russia and China and the progressive peoples in many countries welcomed with satisfaction the good news. "...The fireworks in Beijing on the occasion of the Aigong Treaty of 16 May were even better than yesterday's in Irkutsk, Governor-General N. Murav'yev wrote on 22 August 1858. The Chinese writer Zhan Zhingong was to note later that "Russia is our old neighbor. Many proofs can be found in history of mutual friendship; so far there has been no official proof of hostility."

The settling of the Amur and Maritime areas developed tempestuously. Albazin rose like a phoenix from the ashes; many other Russian settlements were rebuilt; Blagoveshchensk and Khabarovsk were founded. Settlements named after the pioneers appeared along the banks of the Amur and the Ussuri: Poyarkovo, Tolbuzino, Radde, Nevelskoye, Venyukovo...

The ships of the Siberian fleet, headed by P. Kazavevich, systematically surveyed the Sea of Japan from Sakhalin to Korea. In the summer of 1859, during his trip to Japan, N. Murav'yev-Amurskiy (he was made Count Amurskiy for his successful talks in Aigong) sailing aboard the corvette Amerika discovered the Nakhodka Bay and studied the islands of Askolda and Putyatina, the Strelok Straits and the Zolotoy Rog Bay.

The name Vladivostok appeared for the first time in a circular issued by N. Murav'yev-Amurskiy on 15 (27) November 1859. "The considerable preparations which are taking place in England and France for a new war against China make it necessary for us as well to maintain all our ships in a state of readiness.... Our fleet must take to sea...and occupy and strengthen two points for small crews in the harbors of Novgorodskaya (Posyet Bay--the author) and Vladivostok...."

The military transport "Man'yethur," commanded by Aleksandr Jhefner, entered Zolotoy Rog Bay on 20 June (7 July) 1860. One month later the corvette "Griden'" delivered here a new shipment of people and freight. Housing and economic premises were built and that is how the Vladivostok port appeared.

Learning of this, M. Bestuzhev wrote to D. Zavalishin that "...I insisted on choosing a port for the Eastern Ocean and, I believe, this may have encouraged some action...; a fleet was sent to Posyet Bay to build temporary fortifications." The inaccuracy--both in terms of Posyet and Zolotoy Rog--was explained by the fact that Bestuzhev obtained third-hand information on this

matter. What is important is that the Decembrist called for a "future Sevastopol on the Pacific Ocean" and that his dream--Vladivostok!--was fulfilled.

Although the city appeared as a military post, it became a real bridgehead for peace and friendship in the Far East. The respect which the Russian people showed other nations is reflected in the names of merchantmen and navy ships at that time--"Aleut," "Amerika," "Gilyak," "Kalevala," "Kamchadal," "Koreyets," "Man'chzhur," "Tunguz," "Yaponets," ....

N. Murav'yev-Amurskiy retired in 1861 and the position of governor-general of Eastern Siberia was assumed by M. Korsakov. The autocracy was in the throes of a fierce crisis: the abolition of serfdom had not eliminated the peasant troubles, fiercely suppressed by the troops. A new generation emerged in the arena of the struggle, raised on the works of Hertzen, Chernyshevskiy and Dobrolyubov.

The Decembrists, who had welcomed the initial successes on the Amur with such enthusiasm and joy, began to realize that the development of the reunited area was being done poorly. The chaos, fuss and disorder, which M. Bestuzhev had noted in 1857, worsened. "...The attitude toward the first settlers," wrote the Soviet scientist M. Azadovskiy, "took the form of most unbridled arbitrary behavior, which reminded the Decembrists of the methods of organizing the Arakcheyev military settlements. The kray's supply system was exceptionally poor; robbery, bribery and all possible forms of theft, red tape, abuses by local authorities, and so on flourished. However, the general press described the situation on the Amur invariably in most cheerful colors."

The first person to expose the Amur legend was D. Zavalishin, who published a series of articles on the Amur. He was supported by N. Dobrolyubov in his review of the book by R. Maak "A Trip on the Amur." Unlike Zavalishin, however, who believed the root of the evil lay in errors committed by individuals, Dobrolyubov claimed that the reasons for the shortcomings "are not in the features of one individual or another but lie much more deeply--in the social order itself."

"After reading your articles in 'Morskiy Sbornik' [Maritime Collection]," M. Bestuzhev wrote to Zavalishin, "I realized that you had hit the nail on the head..." However, the censorship banned subsequent articles. He was persecuted by the Transbaykal administration and in 1863 Zavalishin was exiled from Siberia to European Russia. This was the only case of its kind!

In expressing his sympathy to Zavalishin, M. Bestuzhev wrote to him that he had predicted that a long time ago. "You were tempted by publicity. In Russia, however, this publicity will remain suppressed for a long time to come." The same letter reads that Bestuzhev's letters to V. Shityngel' on the Amur, "making the rounds of Petersburg eventually fell into the tsar's hands... I am quite pleased with this situation: To begin with, the tsar will not see in them anything contradicting your articles; secondly, I have not spared him (the tsar himself!--the author) for despite your accusations

of the count, the basic evil resides in halfway measures and insufficient energy in the highest level of government." Striking here are both the full coincidence with Dobrolyubov's conclusions and Bestuzhev's amazing courage, who risked so much to write such daring lines.

V. Rayevskiy expressed his view on said imaginary successes no less sharply: "The journalists are shrieking or snorting about some kind of progress, civilization or a new era...." The "first Decembrist," however, believes that in tsarist Russia "decay preceded development." These lines were written in 1857, when many people, even Hertenzen himself, had exaggerated hopes for the rebirth of the country under the new tsar. In 1866, however, Rayevskiy sadly wrote: "The Transbaykal Kray is quite ruined: The Amur has absorbed its material strength.... The Amur, about which you and I once dreamed, is today a bottomless pit in which more than 30 millions in nonrecoverable capital have been sunk forever. The project was spoiled from the very beginning. We were concerned with brilliance, glory and rewards instead of thinking of usefulness and a future. It was the crickets of the young generation who were sent out to organize the area.... Our 'junior brothers' were sawed down, were chopped down to size and have sunk to a loathsome point...."

The progressive people in Russia, awakened by the Decembrists and the revolutionary democrats were also concerned for the future of the country. Their thoughts combined pride in the exploits of the pioneers and bitterness for the methods used in settling Siberia, which under their very eyes was becoming a "country of exile." The noted Russian traveler G. Potanin, who served in Siberia and who had headed expeditions in Mongolia and China, wrote that "the Far East..., i.e., the Amur-Maritime Kray, is Siberia's outpost... Siberia is a gift which the people's mass presented to Russia."

In considering the reasons for the fast progress of the pioneers, E. Pashenskiy wrote that "this was possible only because they did not feel themselves abroad. They considered Siberia their native land. In the eyes of the Conquistadores Cortes and Pizarro all Mexicans and Peruvians...seemed like demons from hell, doomed to disappear from the face of the earth." He added that to any person from Vologda or Vyatich, who volunteered to go east, considered the native population as "junior brothers who should never be insulted in vain." The historian further wrote that the Tungus (Evenks), Buryats and Yakuts "acting as experienced guides," helped to lay the hard road along the "unexplored areas along the Yenisey and the Lena, behind the Baykal and along the Amur," quickly aligned themselves with the newly arrived heroes who gave to their progeny the features of their appearance of today: however with Russian speech in their hearts and the Russian aspiration of the spirit."

Naturally, in this case the march of the pioneers was somewhat idealized (things were not smooth always and everywhere). However, no comparison is possible between this conquest and the acquisition of new territories in other parts of the world, where the new arrivals literally destroyed the natives in fierce colonial wars. In our country the development of Siberia took place peacefully with the exposure of the nomad tribes to a higher culture.

Siberia's troubles, in the view of the progressive people, started as a result of the improper principles governing settlement and the establishment of a bureaucratic administration. After the peace with England was concluded, Adm G. Nevel'skoy wrote that the war with the external enemy had ended but that the internal enemy remained--the frost, insufficient housing and food and crowds of unnecessary officials who, in his view, act like bureaucrats. "The aristocratic families," G. Potanin wrote, "sent to Siberia their failed sons who suffered from idiocy or alcoholism or suffered from an unbearable character, bullies and cheats.... Gubernatorial positions were held by generals who had long before gone mad such as, for example, Lokhvitskiy in Yakutsk or Zaryanko in Tomsk. In the same manner in which European Russia dumped into Siberia its defective goods it colonized Siberia with defective people."

Once against this is not an absolutely accurate interpretation of the social ills which corroded the country. Equally untrue is the fact that Siberia was populated only by "defective" people. N. Chernyshevskiy, for example, believed that Siberia, which received from Russia a steady influx of the most energetic and frequently most developed population, was mentally higher than European Russia.

As we pointed out, the Decembrists and the revolutionary democrats considered autocracy itself and the entire landlord-bourgeois system the "basic evil."

Many were the dreams, pains, hopes and sufferings which linked the Decembrists to the Amur. It was along that river that they were planning their unrealized escapes during their first years of exile. Many of them were seamen, such as N. and M. Bestuzhev, M. Kyukhel'beker, K. Torson, V. Shteyngel', N. Chizhov and others. They conceived of the way across Siberia and beyond via the Baykal and the Amur to the Pacific Ocean as a waterway which, incidentally, is more consistent with the description of the Baykal-Amur Mainline under construction as a "waterway."

How greatly inspiring were the Siberian rivers to them! They wrote of the "wild bark of the Irtysh" (K. Rylev), they looked at "where the Lena and the Ob are splashing their waters along the granite shores" (V. Rayevskiy). In his poems V. Kyukhel'beker mentions the Yenisey and Baykal and virtually all Transbaykal rivers ("Blessed be thou, O Argun! I prefer you to the sullen Onon...", "I parted with Selengoy and said: 'Farewell, Uda!"). N. Chizhov, who was exiled to the remote Olekminsk, wrote the poem "The cranes" in which he sang of the "bright waters of the Amur."

However, the Decembrists did not draw exclusively poetic inspiration from the Siberian rivers. They were also concerned with their strictly practical use as waterways. M. Kyukhel'beker called for connecting the rivers within a single transportation system. Nikita Murav'yev and Sergey Trubetskoy drafted an even more grandiose plan for connecting all rivers of Russia and Siberia within a single water transportation system.

The realistic and important nature of these plans were confirmed in 1881, when the construction was begun of the Ob-Yenisey Canal, which linked the Ket



and the Kem, tributaries of the Ob and the Yenisey. More than 20 sluice-gates, dams and other hydroengineering systems were built in the central part of the canal. The canal did not last long, for all funds were transferred to the Trans-Siberian railroad. Today, however, the question has been raised of restoring this canal, which will enable us to sail from the Urals to the Transbaykal.

Along with the development of a riverine and maritime fleet and laying a highway, the Decembrists drafted programs for railroad building. N. Basargin called for a railroad linking Perm with Tyumen. Nikita Murav'yev made calculations on building a highway from Yakutsk to the Sea of Okhotsk.

G. Baten'kov, still active after 20 years of solitary confinement, drafted a plan for a northern, central and southern Siberia main railroad. It is striking that many sectors of today's Trans-Siberian and the BAM coincide with his drawings. He was the first to speak of a second reunification of Siberia with Russia--the conversion of Siberia into an area of developed economy and high culture.

The uprising of the Decembrists and their exile seem so distant from us. As chained prisoners they went to Siberia by foot or on horseback. However, they were still alive when the first railroads were built in Russia. Finding out that the engineer Gerstner had begun to build a track to Tsarskoye Selo, N. Bestuzhev wrote that "this is unquestionably a whim rather than a necessity; however...we understand Gerstner, who would like to prove sooner and on a small scale the possibility of railroad traveling in winter. We see with pleasure that Russia is not falling behind Europe in education and, in our view, no better means of education exist than easy and fast communications among all parts of the country. This is an important point which so far has been a matter of attention only from the commercial point of view.... We, Russians, have in many cases outstripped the other Europeans: railroads are not new. They have existed in many ironworks for hauling ore God knows since when."

How greatly mistaken are some memoir writers and contemporaries of the Decembrists and the pseudohistorians who have claimed that "the champions of freedom" were crushed in exile, sunk in daily concerns and abandoned their ideals! A perfect answer was given to them as early as 1829 by A. Odoyevskiy:

We have sacred thrusts  
Warm feelings and bright thoughts,  
Lofty and worthy thoughts!...  
A tall building is rising toward the sky:  
Invisibly, every day  
The century grows through this toil  
But one step after another  
Man is building the century.

How strong is the spirit coming from these lines! How great their historical optimism and faith in the people and progress of mankind!

"Why does entertainment increase with antiquity?" N. Bestuzhev wrote.

"People disappear..., but attachment to them remains eternal and it increases

in strength the more distant the people become. Is this not proof of human kinship transmitted from generation to generation, increasingly accumulating in the distant offspring the more the generations have used such an attachment?" In writing this, N. Bestuzhev could not know what an exceptional attachment would future generations feel for the Decembrists. Pushkin prophetically predicted that "your sad labor will not be in vain...." At the turn of the 20th century V. I. Lenin confirmed the poet's prediction: "...Their cause was not lost."

In discussing this short, yet very profound, thought, some historians believed that the merit of the Decembrists consisted merely in the fact that they awakened Herten. However, if we sum up all of Lenin's statements on the Decembrists we will reach the conclusion that their historical exploit lies above all in the fact that they were the first to launch a revolutionary movement against autocracy and for the liberation of the peasants. It was precisely this which inspired Herten in the struggle against tsarism and the fact that "the best members of the nobility helped to awaken the people."

"The slogans of the Decembrists, enriched, expanded and raised to new heights," M. V. Nechkin writes, "became part of the struggle of subsequent generations in revolutionary Russia." It was no accident that their names were recalled during the revolutionary situation of 1859-1861 and at the turn of the 20th century. In the leaflets printed in Petersburg and Yekaterinoslav in December 1900, the progressive workers and the social democrats openly called themselves the "spiritual grandsons" of the Decembrists and, in analyzing the reasons for their defeat, spoke of the need to involve the people's masses in the revolution. The proclamation of the Yekaterinoslav RSDWP committee ended with the slogans: "May the Memory of the Decembrists, the Fighters for Freedom, Live Forever!" "Down With Autocracy!" and "Long Live Socialism!"

It is profoundly symbolic that Lenin's ISKRA, which played an exceptional role in the creation of the Bolshevik Party, opened with the line by A. Odoyevskiy "From a spark will come the flame!" In October 1917, when Lenin wrote that "any delay in the uprising is like death," he clearly had in mind the bitter and bloody experience of 14 December.

Finding themselves in Siberia and learning firsthand of the bitterness and troubles of the exiles, the settlers and the local population, the Decembrists realized how "far they were from the people." They went to the people and dedicated a great deal of efforts toward their education and for conquering and developing the "country of exiles." With full justification this selfless activity as well must be included as part of the work of the Decembrists, a work the greatness of which is becoming increasingly bright and attractive as time goes on.

The present article is an attempt to describe the specific activities of the Decembrists, which have left material traces, such as descriptions of minerals, geographic and other scientific studies and plans for the transformation of the area. However, it would be far more difficult to evaluate and describe the spiritual influence of the Decembrists on the people around

them, those who they met on their way to exile and those whom they met later, by the will of fate, in their place of exile. Irkutsk, Selenginsk, Chita, Petrovskiy Zavod and other areas in Eastern Siberia, where the Decembrists lived after their exile, had a special moral microclimate. The officials and the rich not only respected but feared the Decembrists who rose like one in defense of the poor and who healed and taught their children. The local population literally worshipped them. "They are God and not people!" the Buryats used to say.

Everyone who came to Eastern Siberia wanted to meet with them. The noted China expert, N. Bichurin, the first Buryat scientist D. Banzarov, the brother of the noted physician, the literary worker N. Botkin, the British traveler T. Atkinson and the painters the Swede K. Maser and the Pole L. Nemirowski visited Selenginsk, where the brothers M. and N. Bestuzhev and K. Torson lived. A. Shtukenberg, who was trying to find the highway around the Baykal, who met the brothers Bestuzhev, V. Rayevskiy and A. Yakubovich in 1839, wrote: "It was strange and very entertaining to listen to these people removed from society but still so full of life."

The spiritual influence of the Bestuzhev brothers was so powerful that after meeting with them the highly placed official V. Filosofov wrote the following: "...A powerful and blossoming building is rising on the wreckage of autocratic power; the grateful progeny will erect a monument to Bestuzhev and the other victims of the 14th where the Alexander Column stands today."

After the amnesty, the Decembrists who were still alive began to return from Siberia. Tsarism had done its utmost to ensure that they were forgotten: for 30 years any mention of them in the press and even conversation was forbidden. Unbowed and in high spirits, white-haired, they appeared as though from non-existence and were welcomed as heroes by the progressive people. In order to remove the halo which surrounded their names, "by supreme order" the book "Ascension to the Throne of Emperor Nicholas I," by M. Korf was published. This was the means chosen by Alexander II for dealing a counterstrike also at Hertzen's "Northern Star" which was beginning to publish materials on the Decembrists.

Joining in open battle, Hertzen wrote his outstanding work "Fourteenth December and Emperor Nicholas," in which he properly assessed Korf's servile work and struck a crushing blow at autocracy. Not stopping at that, Hertzen challenged the Decembrists themselves and their descendants to send him his memoirs. Responding to this appeal, the Decembrists eagerly undertook to collect preserved materials and to write new memoirs and send them to London. Within a short time Hertzen published a number of outstanding memoirs by the brothers M. and N. Bestuzhev, M. Murav'yev-Apostol, I. Yakushkin and others.

In the sharp ideological struggle which was waged against the background of the ripening revolutionary situation of 1859-1861, at a time when even not all progressive people were aware of the nature of the feat of the Decembrists, these memoirs played a tremendous role, admitted both by enemies and friends. After reading the memoirs of the Decembrists, P. Vyazemskiy, Pushkin's former friend, wrote: "Not one of them shows even a shade of

repentance and awareness that they had engaged in a mad, not to say criminal, project.... They have forgotten nothing and learned nothing. They were perpetuated and became ossified on 14 December. To them, even 30 years later, the day of 15 December, during which they could sober up and come to their senses, has not come yet."

Better than any word of praise, the malicious lines of this retrograde in whom "the splendid thrusts of the soul" had long burned out, speak of the gravity and relevance of the recollections of the Bestuzhev brothers and their fellow workers.

It was thus that at the end of the 1850s and the beginning of the 1860s the Decembrists once again emerged in the arena of the struggle against autocracy, contributing to the development of a new revolutionary situation. Therefore, the Decembrists not only awakened Hertzen but also helped him to awaken the interest of progressive Russia in their cause for which they had been shot and hanged, while subsequent generations remembered the errors of 1825 during the great and decisive battles against autocracy in the 1905 and 1917 revolutions.

The Decembrists had a tremendous influence on subsequent generations of Siberians. In December 1861 the first commercial caravan left Kyakhta for Beijing after the Russo-Chinese 1858-1860 treaties. They included three young salesmen: A. Startsev, I. Tokmakov and M. Shevelev. The first was N. Bestuzhev's own son, who had been raised by his friend D. Startsev so that the shadow cast by his Decembrist father would not darken his son's fate. I. Tokmakov (incidentally, M. Kandinskaya, his mother, was related to the Evenk Prince Gantimur) was close to the Bestuzhevs and their children. Shevelev's father, Grigoriy Aleksandrovich, who had assisted in the secret correspondence conducted by the Decembrists, had been the victim of a report by R. Medoks, the provocateur.

Raised in the progressive views of the Decembrists, all three warmly supported Hertzen's words of freedom. Furthermore, as a tea merchant, Startsev was in touch with him and received from London "The North Star" and KOLOKOL across the southern seas, via China, to Kyakhta, from which point the forbidden publications were distributed across all of Siberia. In addition to trade, A. Startsev was engaged in publishing: he printed the works of Russian Sinologists and engaged in construction: 40 houses made of stone had been built and the first Chinese railroad had been laid in Tientsin, financed by him. A very erudite man, who spoke English, French, German, Chinese, Manchurian, Mongol and Buryat, he enjoyed a high reputation in diplomatic circles.

As a person with many friends and acquaintances among the Chinese (who incidentally, referred to him as pao shi--precious stone), Startsev encouraged the strengthening of friendship between Russia and China. The very important talks between the high official Li Hongzhang and the Russian diplomat N. Ladyzhenskiy had been initiated with his personal participation. In a letter dated 5 December 1886, addressed to P. S. Popov, the Russian consul general in Beijing, Startsev wrote that "they made their positions clear and exchanged political views.... Therefore, great friendship exists between



Russia and China. All of this was helped by the...good reception which Wu Daren received in Vladivostok and the good conclusion of the matter of border demarcation in the Ussuri Kray..." (RO GBL [rayon department of the State Library imeni V. I. Lenin], f. 218, k. 763, No 21). As can be seen, Startsev contributed to the success of important talks as a result of which the border between Russia and China was established in the Maritime area and has remained unchanged since.

At the beginning of the 1890s A. Startsev left China for Vladivostok, the creation of which had been so urgently encouraged by its uncle M. Bestuzhev. His friend M. Shevelev had moved here earlier, and founded, together with I. Tokmakov, the first steamship company. However, for health reasons Tokmakov had moved to the Crimea, where he became one of the pioneers in domestic industrial wine production.

The fate of this ancient line, the roots of which go back to Kantimur and Kandinskiy and whose offshoots became interwoven with the Decembrist tree, was amazing: Sergey, I. Tokmakov's son, married Ye. Startseva, N. Bestuzhev's granddaughter. What is even more interesting is that in the course of only two generations this family covered the distance from adopting the views of the Decembrist and Hertzen to the direct propaganda of Lenin's ideas: M. Vodovozova, I. Tokmakov's daughter, published Il'ich's first books "Economic Studies and Articles" and "The Development of Capitalism in Russia."

It is impossible to describe here in detail the varied contributions which the blood and spiritual descendants of the Decembrists made to the development of the Far East. Let me point out only that N. Bestuzhev's descendants built Vladivostok, developed coal deposits, participated in the search for petroleum on Sakhalin and in the building of railroads, defended Port Arthur and fought in the Manchurian hills in the Russo-Japanese War at the turn of the century. To this day N. Bestuzhev's direct descendants live and work in Vladivostok. A. Odoyevskiy's prophetic lines have been fulfilled:

No, believe in resurrection on earth:  
Your tribe will come to life in your descendants  
And the sons of my sacred generation  
Will cover Russia and will blossom.

"The past...is linked to the present with a continuing chain of events stemming one from the other.... The moment one end is reached another starts." These words by A. Chekhov unwittingly kept coming to mind in the course of my entire trip along the Baykal-Amur Mainline. How to forget them when seeing between the Baykal and Severo-Muysk tunnels the Bestuzhevskaya and Kyukhel'bekerskaya railroad stations, and Bestuzhovo, located 40 kilometers east of Tynda! It is a splendid fact that today's builders of the BAM recall the Decembrists and perpetuate their names! Anyone who passes by these stations and along the bridges across the Lena and the Amur remembers the "champions of freedom" who, like P. Kropotkin, M. Venyukov, G. Nevel'skoy, N. Przheval'skiy, V. Arsen'yev and many others made a tremendous contribution to the development of Siberia and the Far East.

In the course of my latest trip in the Far East I flew over thousands of kilometers and traveled along the border. I experienced special feelings in Blagoveshchensk. It was before the winter. The rainy season was behind us and the snow had not as yet begun to fall. The transparent autumn waters of the Amur had dropped. The river, powerful in spring and summer, had narrowed, one could touch the right bank with one's hand. Opposite Blagoveshchensk, Heihe looked entirely abandoned.

"What is the attitude of the simple Chinese toward us?" I asked by fellow traveler. "Good. Once we caught up with a Chinese boat while sailing our launch. The Chinese fishermen shouted something and greeted us."

"Apparently he had not forgotten his Russian."

"All elderly Chinese know our language..."

I suddenly recalled that it was precisely here, on the Zeya, in 1644, that Vasilii Poyarkov had reached the Amur and that in 1857 Mikhail Bestuzhev had helped organize a reception in honor of guests from Aygun. How warmly the Russians welcomed at that time ordinary Chinese and their officials! How many warm fraternal meetings had been held here in the first years after the proclamation of the PRC!

...In the evening the electric lights burst out over Blagoveshchensk. The entire left bank was flooded with the light of bright lanterns and neon signs, whereas the right bank was gripped by fog and only occasionally could lights be seen in the dark of the night. I urgently wished for the scattering of the autumn fog and cold sooner on the other side of the river along with the great-power prejudices and for the Amur to become once again the river of friendship as the Decembrists themselves wished!

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## SCIENTIFIC HISTORICISM AND THE COOPERATION OF THE ARTS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) pp 82-92

[Last article by the noted Soviet historian Vladimir Terent'yevich Pashuto, USSR Academy of Sciences corresponding member (1918-1983)]

[Text] I would like in this article to express some thoughts based on practical experience on the subject of improving scientific historicism and strengthening creative cooperation between historians and men of literature and the arts.

One of the main papers to be presented at the forthcoming 16th International Congress of Historical Sciences will be "The Motion Picture and History;" for hours on end historians discuss training, scientific and publicistic topics on television; the character of Lenin is cast on the stage of the MKhAT [Moscow Academic Art Theater] in the dramatic turn of events against the background of the beginning age of the socialist renovation of the country; a well-known composer is restoring the melodies and rhythms of ancient Russian music; a painter is recreating in his bright heroes his vision of the Kulikovo events; Ivan the Terrible, Peter the Great and Mikhail Kutuzov are depicted on the stage of the largest operas.... All the arts--ancient and modern--stretch their vibrating arms toward the historians. As we know, there was no muse of artistic prose among the nine daughters of Zeus and Mnemosyne, for within "history," as understood by the ancients, historiography and belles lettres syncretically coexisted. Such was also the case in Rus, where the "Tale of the Times" is at the origin of both history and literature.

It is not astounding that throughout its independent existence, fiction, deprived of the protection of the gods and its own muse, had leaned toward Clio. It is important to emphasize that it is precisely with the help of artistic historiography that the science of history most frequently nurtures the thoughts and images of its sisters. It is natural, therefore, to assist in their rapprochement precisely now, when the muses are not silent at all but have become militant. Actually, the ancients were also familiar with the muses in that quality and realized the great power of their unity: according to Homer, when Thamir "dared to boast that he will steal victory," in their songs he was not only defeated but deprived of his eyesight, hearing and voice.

The historians, who are aware of their responsibility in this important cooperation, persistently seek means to strengthen it. The demand of

historicism is a mark of the times. It is increasingly spreading not only among the historical disciplines but is entering demography, law, literature and aesthetics. That is why the study of historicism itself becomes particularly important. This applies above all to scientific historicism in the light of Lenin's legacy. A great deal remains to be accomplished on its basis in the study of pre-Marxist forms of historicism (knowledge of history) --Old Testament, folklore-epic, medieval and modern and most modern times, remembering that the historicism of an age and its history are not one and the same.

The study of alternating conceptual paradigms will reveal the way practical historicism matured and became ready to explode the mystic sacred history of the Middle Ages, the assertion of bourgeois protohistoricism and the subsequent triumph of scientific historicism. This is a most interesting topic!

However, a situation has currently developed in this area which is hardly likely to create a feeling of satisfaction. Tremendous data have been acquired on historiography as the combination of historical monographs by individual authors, trends, countries and continents. Paradoxically however, the major problem of the appearance, establishment and development of historicism in connection with the sociopolitical development of the huge European area remains understudied. This is a repeat of the situation with the overall concept of universal history which lacks a study of the development of the interpenetration among the "histories" of different countries and the synthesis and development of regional, continental and universal systems in the areas of politics, economics and culture. The results of such a study would have simplified the use of comparative-historical methods in the study of the natural yet asynchronous social progress achieved by the peoples on earth and would facilitate the reaching of the cherished objective of scholastic social science--the creation of compact textbooks on general and domestic history, imbued with thoughts and comparisons. All of this has become particularly clear, understandably, because we have our "Universal History."

It is precisely along this way that we can trace the establishment and development of reciprocal concepts among nations and determine the position of historical thinking in the development of socioethnic value systems and their influence on international stereotypes or, as they are currently known, chronotopes. Such work is already under way and is successfully advancing in the science of history which has ancient traditions and in which medievalists, in selecting and classifying sources, try to define all of its initial components and their actual and ideological characteristics, both domestic and foreign. In this case they rely on the refined methods of analysis and the richest experience gained in the areas of auxiliary historical disciplines, such as archaeography, paleography, diplomacy, study of texts, sphragistics, historical geography and others. Here as well, however, (as, actually, in the science of history as a whole), success in resolving contemporary research problems largely depends on the technical support given to the work of the historian in all areas, from archives to the publication of books. Should we wait for the underestimating of technical facilities to influence the content of our science of history and its international reputation?



The question of the correlation between history and contemporaneity and historical traditions and legacy is quite complex. It was no accident that it became a topic of special debates, particularly in the GDR, where the country's historical past and present make it particularly topical. Our German colleagues (H. Bartel, G. Lotzek, W. Kuttler, J. Herrmann and others) justifiably assume that historical legacy is, strictly speaking, social. It is socially determined, for which reason tradition is part of it only to the extent to which it serves the cause of the triumph of communism. Consequently, it is only socialist, revolutionary-democratic, national liberation and generally historically progressive traditions, both domestic and international, which are a permanent part of it, so to say.

However, society and history exist objectively while the legacy of predecessors goes far beyond the framework of what we use as legacy. It is far broader and it is being mastered by our scientific thinking and art only gradually and slowly, turning into our own legacy. This is a very complex process with flexible and inner-penetrating boundaries. I believe that distinguishing between the concepts of "heritage" and "legacy" would facilitate its study. However, we must not make a fetish out of concepts: heritage and legacy are historical: as historicism deepens the content of the former increases at the expense of the latter. The thoughtless inclusion of the concept of heritage into that of legacy, not interpreted in a party-minded style, as well as their nihilistic rejection, impoverishes legacy and improperly limits our cultural wealth, slowing down communist upbringing and historical progress. All of this leads us once again to emphasize the most important role of scientific historicism.

It is essential in this connection to define the nature of the Russophobia in the political practices of a number of European countries of today, which goes back to medieval sources. This would enable us to determine far more profoundly the historical base and traditional nature of some political doctrines and also better to understand the development of a socially heterogeneous domestic Slavophilism (as a variety of bourgeois-land owners' liberalism), Pan Slavism, with its xenophobia and Europhobia and, finally, neo-Slavism. Without understanding their historical nature one can easily lose the evaluation criteria and either become their defender or fall into national nihilism, or else pretend that these most important topics do not exist in science at all. The latest studies make us hopeful that the comprehensive development of this complex topic will take place.

This approach is particularly needed in assessing the role of Russia in modern European history. In this connection we find a great deal of disparity of thought in the works of historians and literary workers, frequently based on one-sided judgments, unrelated to dialectics and historical objectivity, in which some tend to see Russia only as the policeman of Europe whereas others ask us not to forget that Russia, which lost thousands of soldiers, was the bulwark of the national rebirth of Greece, Bulgaria, Romania and Serbia (and not only them); some write of the subjugation of Finland by tsarism; others, citing Finnish historians, note the fruitful stage in the life of that country within the framework of Russian autonomy; some condemn Skobelev as a conqueror in Asia whereas others praise him as the liberator

of Bulgaria, justifiably citing the honor which his name and deeds instill in that fraternal country....

Obviously, some researchers, literary workers and publicists, who are unable to think dialectically, look at history in an excessively simplistic manner. However, Russia's prerevolutionary past does not consist exclusively of tsarist policy. Being an imperial system, it should be considered within the framework of the single historical process of Europe and Asia, in the manner in which this is done in assessing the shaping of its domestic polyethnic structure (by far not to the detriment of a party-minded and class-oriented approach), in which once again the objectives of tsarist policy certainly did not always coincide with objective results. The history of Russia must be recreated as a legitimate evolution of the internal (social) antagonistic structure, taking into consideration the reciprocal influence between the center and the periphery. This would enable us properly to assess the significance of Great Russia in the rapid development of outlying areas which, under its aegis, obtained external security and broad access to the sea. The typological study of this system, compared with other polyethnic empires in the world, is the path to increasing our knowledge of the sources of Russian imperialism, its general and specific features and, in the final account, the prerequisites themselves for the October Revolution.

It is precisely this kind of approach that enables us to preserve what is valuable in the history of relations between the peoples of Russia and other nations and which should become part of our legacy while, at the same time, firmly reject the vile conjectures of "Sovietologists" who are trying to present reactionary pan-Slavism, great power chauvinism and all types of obscurantism as such a legacy. This means that the theory of progress as well must be especially developed. It is precisely within this theory that we must dialectically present the combination of social with national factors and emphasize the indirect and conflicting nature of this combination and the importance of selecting within the framework of class-antagonist systems sufficiently representative periods, for "the longer the period and the broader the area under study the closer this axis comes to the axis of economic development and the more parallel to it it becomes" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 39, p 176), and, consequently, the more obvious economic and political results and events become. It is also probably then that what is poetically known as the "spirit of the time" (Goethe) will appear in its true features, filled with sadness and joy. What could happen in the opposite case is what occasionally happens in novels in which the annexation of Novgorod by Moscow is described only from the point of view of the happiness felt by Moscow's Kremlin or strictly from the sad point of view of the country estate of the noblewoman Boretskaya, ignoring subsequent domestic and international developments of the huge country.

The solution of this problem has yet another important feature precisely today, when men of science and the arts are trying to master the truly tremendous wealth of sources and ideas which have become part of our historical science over the past quarter of a century. History proves that historicism is established not by itself but in the course of a steady and increasingly aggravated ideological struggle and that the fighters for progressive social

ideas hold an almost predominant position in the ranks of the immortal martyrs for science. This struggle is continuing and becoming increasingly aggravated today, when history is being turned into a means for settling political accounts with the communists and when bourgeois scientists and scholars are trying to eliminate from universal history entire nations while enclosing man himself within the exclusive framework of his own country, state, enterprise or family. Furthermore, judging by the discussions held at recent international congresses of historians, the supporters of "neohistoricism" are zealously preaching, under the guise of depoliticizing history, the convergence of ideology, although they themselves perfectly realize the significance of ideology and are persistently using politics in school education.

The anticommunists reject history as a science, for its laws are hostile to capitalism and are prepared to identify the doom of their system with that of the planet. The picture is striking: on the one hand, the power is held by statesmen armed with knowledge of the objective laws of social development, which enables them actively to influence the global historical process, accelerating it and destroying colonialism hated by mankind as well as all social and national oppression of peoples in different continents; on the other, nearsighted rulers advised by uninspired positivists-pseudohistorians and Russophobes, such as Brzezinski, Pipes, Kaiser and other blind guides and wild apostles who reject true progress and peace and, through the force of arms and international terrorism, try to keep the obsolete classes in power. Never before has the significance of historical experience in forecasting the future of mankind ever reached such global proportions and truly humanistic heights. Historians are also aware of this aspect of their increasing responsibility.

The principle of communist party-mindedness is the basic principle of scientific historicism. It organically combines objectivity, patriotism and internationalism. This principle also calls for the study of the internal laws of the development of the science of history itself and their inviolability which is based on harmony. Periodization, which is the focal point of historical methodology, plays a main part among the most important theoretical problems. Our scientists have resolved its main problems on the basis of Russian history. The development of major problems of synchronizing the histories of the peoples of the country, above all the histories of their working class and peasantry, is more difficult; work must be done on the history of correlation of ideas and institutions and an assessment is needed of sociopolitical thinking as a periodization factor. Finally, there is no periodization of the polyethnic culture of Russia.

In the solution of these problems (on a contemporary level, using the methods of systems analysis) two topics remain most essential: the origins of feudalism and the establishment of capitalism. Another remaining important task is the comparative historical study of the history of our country within the framework of the European and Asia communities. In turn, this requires a profound knowledge (and collective creative work by scientists of various nationalities) of the specific history of these areas. Naturally, this will require a comparative analysis of domestic and foreign institutions, norms, terms and events as we follow the direction set in the works of B. D. Grekov, A. I. Neusykhin, L. V. Cherepnin and others. It is Leninist historicism



which enables us to raise comparative-historical analysis to the level which the works of D. I. Mendeleev and N. I. Vavilov attained in the natural sciences.

Life continually confronts us with the need to defend the principles of party-mindedness and historicism (in its conceptual and ethical aspect) above all in the ideological struggle against the enemies of Marxism in international historiography. It also forces us to make critical assessments of theoretically immature and historiographically faulty varieties of amateur forgeries by domestic creators of "legends." Unfortunately, such historical romanticism, which was popular in the historiography of the nobility in Russia in its time, is quite popular today, particularly in the rapidly expanding "intermediary genre" which, placed between fiction and popular science, compromises both. Strange though it might seem, academic historiography as well is occasionally affected by such romanticism in the case of some periods of history, most ancient in particular. However, the time of historical amateurs is past and the higher level of historical education of artists of all kinds is a matter which brooks no delay. It would be advisable to notice on the part of people who think that history is an easily accessible science and that all that is needed for writing quickly a historical novel or scenario is a strong wish to do so.

Another urgent task is the following: the millenium of the adoption of Christianity by ancient Rus will be celebrated soon. This is an important and conflicting event which enabled our country to become part of the progressive peoples of medieval Europe, which strengthened its political reputation and cultural relations and which also canonized feudal power. The foreign enemies of our country have already begun to launch "petty intrigues" on this subject: although they are alien to our past, they seek in it grounds for defaming our present; they are interested not in the defense of faith or the protection of people who think differently and progressively. They would support any devil, including Tsar Nicholas the Bloody, with Jesuitic pretense and hypocrisy. Our historians and philosophers must prepare on time scientific works which will give popularizers and propagandists good materials to welcome suitably this event and reject with proper arguments the pseudo-free dissonance of bourgeois information media.

In defending our theoretical platform, particularly when dealing with concealed falsifications, the historian must act as a publicist. He must convincingly and sharply criticize his ideological enemy. "To write about what is harmful without 'anger,' means to write boringly," Lenin asserted ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 48, p 78). In this he followed Engels, who deemed it necessary to write about the enemy "with scorn and mockery" (K. Marx and F. Engels, op. cit., vol 35, p 140). Alas, our historical journals cannot boast of vivid polemic articles or, in general, of a variety of genres. They allow stylistic variety quite unwillingly. They should include pamphlets, essays, vivid polemics or, in a word, many elements of lively and attractive journalism, including human warmth alien to the official monotony of information on the life and work of historians. In this sense we can learn from writers who publish articles on Soviet classics, on leading creative writers, on literary schools and on the life of their



colleagues. The old and great tradition of personal anthologies, which are so important in training cadres and defending the prestige of science, has disappeared among historians, meaning academic historians specifically (in the VUZes this has been preserved, which puts the USSR Academy of Sciences in an unequal position). For some reason the latest anthologies of the works of one noted modern scientist or another do not mention this openly and, most importantly, do not include a list of scientific works and reviews of such works, which is the most important indicator of the conceptual value and international recognition of that scientist.

I fear that in reading this article men of literature and the arts may note ironically that it is futile for historians to try to act as mentors of writers, composers and painters. Let us immediately point out that claims made in political articles notwithstanding, the serious historians do not claim to play such a role in the least, the more so since we already mentioned only a few of the problems which require a practical solution. Yet many differences are found among historians, philosophers and sociologists on differently interpreted concepts such as "historical materialism," "methodology," "logic," "system" and even "history" and "contemporaneity." Is it amazing, therefore, that there is no unanimity among writers and literary workers in defining the concept of "historical genre?" Extensive participation in such debates is our joint task, for we support a fruitful alliance between the writers' "study of man" and the study of historical sources. What is important is that such debates are based on the theory of Marxism-Leninism, enriching the knowledge of the debaters and those who read them. The history of literature and the arts confirms the contribution of historicism to broadening the views of the artist and the usefulness of the alliance among all creatively thinking people.

Domestic literature and art have followed the twisting road to historicism, noted by indicative changes in accepted paradigms. Typical examples of this kind are found in Hertzen's "Past and Thoughts," which is a bitter criticism of European bourgeois democracy, and the transformation of North America from Radishchev's "state" of freedom into Gorkiy's "City of the Yellow Devil" and Yesenin's "Iron Mirgorod."

The history of Russian music tells us about the same type of conceptual alliance of its progressive leaders, from Glinka to Serov and Rimskiy-Korsakov, with Belinskiy, Chernyshevskiy and Stasov. Glinka's heroic-epic-symphonic works owe a great deal of their development to the successful turn of musical classics to the literary-historical legacy of Pushkin, Lermontov, Ryleyev and others. Let us recall the tremendous amount of independent historical research done by Musorgskiy, Borodin and Tchaikovskiy to understand the reason for which, despite the censorship of the tsarist musical authorities, these giants of harmony were able to surmount the domination of Italian opera in Russia and comprehensively to include the Russian patriotic idea in the various forms of music, which they considered a "means of talking with people, rather than a target" (Musorgskiy). It is also important to emphasize that the patriotic "heroic" topic in their works was socially intensified and that the people, still silent in Pushkin's "Boris Godunov," imperatively demanded his death in the scene "At Kroma." Naturally, it is no

accident that the characters of Pugachev and Razin attracted Musorgskiy and Rimskiy-Korsakov. They knew that folk melodies blend into national music and that the immortal "Bach created German music from the chorale" (Taneyev).

Thinking of the place of historical tradition in Soviet music, we are pleased above all by the continuity in the development of the patriotic into the social-patriotic topic with the embodiment of the great revolutionary accomplishments of our society in symphonic and operatic music. We have something to be proud of when we listen to Prokof'yev, Shostakovich, Asaf'yev, Gliere, etc. At the same time, we keep alive, particularly in Sviridov's works, the tradition of the Russian romance, which is so greatly important in education. Another pleasing tradition is the turning of great masters to ancient folk music, both laic and spiritual. In listening to R. Shchedrin, particularly his poem on Pugachev's execution, I have frequently asked myself why we pay attention to spiritual foreign music while frequently ignoring the great treasury of domestic music? Is it that our mass audience has not matured sufficiently to recognize its nonreligious general aesthetic meaning, so that its masterpieces may be included more frequently in concert programs. Incidentally, this would deprive the Orthodox Church of the possibility of acting as its only protector and interpreter, while depriving chatterers addressing us from a variety of "voices" of a substantial share of their musical programs.

Paintings or, speaking from the strictly professional point of view, the graphic sources of history, are related to historicism no less than is music. This topic drew the particular attention of historians in the preparation of the books "Illustrated History of the USSR" and "Moscow. Illustrated History." The wealth of Russian iconography is infinite. It is valuable also because medieval man himself perceived the icon as a work of history. Today, as we survey our iconography in its almost 1,000 years of development, and as we study it within the context of history, we find in it a sensitive reflection of the sorrows and joys experienced by the fatherland, made more expressive by the fact that Russified church personages, our own citizens and muzhiks, look at us from icons depicting biblical subjects. However, iconography is not all-embracing and we must not forget that it is ideologically and socially limited.

Paradoxically, our centuries-old history reflects quite unevenly and, as a whole, insufficiently adequately our views on the historical process as reflected in paintings and sculptures. Actually, our assessments must be historical: naturally, it is difficult to accept Svyatoslav or Dmitriy Donskiy in Roman, Byzantine or Russian imperial clothing. However, we must remember that within those same classical academic traditions sculptures created works which have become historical symbols of the people. Such is the case with Minin and Pozharskiy by Martos, Peter the Great by Falcone, Suvorov by Kozlovskiy and Nestor-Letopisets and Yermak by Antokol'skiy.

The Russian realists left us a valuable legacy in the paintings of Repin, Surikov, Rerikh, Vasnetsov, Perov, Ge, Vereshchagin, Yaroshenko and many others, thus confirming that the development of painting followed the way of music. V. V. Stasov showed perfectly why Repin's "Barge Haulers" replaced

Vasnetsov's "Bogatyr's:" "a powerful but oppressed force arose in its triumphant greatness (see "Izbr. Soch." [Selected Works], in three volumes, Vol III, Moscow, 1952, pp 256-257).

Historians and educators are awaiting the help of the painters. Here again growing historicism opens new horizons. Those involved increasingly understand that the traditions of the past are valuable in life and particularly in terms of the past and that in the present world the monuments of the past change their social and sometimes national nature by enriching traditions: an icon which loses its religious significance remains a monument of art; from a symbol of imperial despotism, a palace square becomes the symbol of the overthrow of bourgeois-landowning oppression by the people; the Hitlerite flags which the Soviet soldiers trampled under their feet are no longer symbols of fascist conquest but expressive testimony of the victories of the Soviet people who routed fascism. Many more such examples could be cited.

The Soviet masters of the brush and the chisel are seeking their way to history. As was accurately pointed out at the Sixth Congress of USSR Painters, ideological depth is based on the historical experience of art; amateurism, which frequently "dons the garb of innovation, using the premise that true innovation starts from zero, without memory, without the burden of the achievements, passions, thoughts and feelings of its predecessors, is inadmissible." Comrade P. N. Demichev justifiably said that "we must preserve not only historical monuments but the best moral and spiritual traditions of the people. This means that we must not allow spiritual culture to be diluted or to lose its popular roots."

The weak side in the manner in which painters depict historical topics can be defined quite clearly. A talented painter who can reach the heart of the viewer looking at the heroic blockaded people of Leningrad or the courageous portraits of fighters in Vietnam and Chile, is both a witness and a contemporary. When he turns to the history of previous centuries he is faced with several obstacles which are quite difficult to surmount before becoming a participant and a witness of the great accomplishments of its contemporaries. The main obstacle is the difficulty of accurately interpreting prime sources, such as chronicles, laws, memoirs and others.

Our predecessors were hardly simpletons. To realize this we should consider the words of a compatriot of Aleksandr Nevskiy, the observant misanthrope Daniil Zatochnik: "Look at my inner and not my outer self." This calls for identifying the social essence, the "social hypocrisy" of medieval sources of information which in their official (i.e., predominant) aspect are imbued with the ideas of class conciliation and the "general good." We must identify the profound lining of these externally pious writings. We must be able to avoid defending an imaginary social harmony or plunge into the other harmful extreme: the thoughtless blackening of the socially limited patriotism of our predecessors. This is no easy task. It must be clearly formulated and resolved by every man of art at the preparatory stage. The prospects of a painter along this way will be the brighter the greater his knowledge and the deeper his historicism are and the more completely he is able to embody not only the emotional epic or commonplace nature of patriotism (as did the old



realists as well as Nesterov and Korin) but the social nature of patriotism as well. This would require painstaking scientific and historical research and new means of expression. People's Artist of the USSR Yevgeniy Nesterenko noted quite aptly that "one must know a great deal in order to feel accurately." A tremendous amount of work, talent and obsession are needed.

If a historian is allowed to express a view on paintings, let me point out that I am not inspired by any blind copying of iconographic traditions (why not risk giving it the wealth of a properly studied medieval life, which is so clearly reflected in miniatures and other art forms which escaped the strict church censorship?); however, nor do I like the destruction of national forms by modernists. Amazingly, in any big museum, be it in Chicago, Paris, Vienna or Prague, the viewer who reacts to history strongly feels the pleasure of national artistic chronicles and an involvement with the spirit of the people. However, in all those places, in looking at the modernists, he finds himself in some kind of cosmopolitan chaos which loses national features and is in harmony with a substantial share of sexual naturalism. Obviously, there are exceptions to this but are they not the confirmation of the rule? The genius of Picasso--the destroyer of form--proved to be suitable precisely in depicting *Guernica*, a symbol of destruction of life. Such coincidences, alas, are infrequent. People who live a rich life prefer to see on the canvas not death as such but life or, if death is inevitable, death for the sake of life.

The same applies to the theater and the motion picture, where we frequently see efforts to sacrifice the profound social meaning of a work for the sake of an "original interpretation" or, by misinterpreting criticism, sink to the level of ethnographic naturalism, demonstrating the imaginary unsuitability of the works of the old masters to provide a socially meaningful recreation.

Efforts to vulgarize history for the sake of comic entertainment and to lower dramatic conflicts to a philistine level are unattractive. Let us remember K. S. Stanislavskiy's behest: "Above all be careful not to undertake a supertask or related action; be on guard against a trend imposed from elsewhere and other aspirations and objectives alien to the play." The great director called for the maximal embodiment of supertasks based on a profound knowledge of life and preventing its reduction and diminution to the level of a "philistine task" (see K. S. Stanislavskiy, "Stat'i. Rechi. Besedy. Pis'ma" [Articles. Speeches. Talks. Letters], Moscow, 1953, pp 513, 678).

Leninyana, an area in which we have happily developed a strong tradition based on the accomplishments of Pogodin, Romm and Kapler, deserves a particularly careful treatment in the theater and the motion picture. It is pleasing that of late other historical topics as well have received an original and accurate interpretation in films such as "Peter's Youth" and "Vasilii Buslayev."

The boundaries of artistic imagination are quite vast: they are determined by the depicted age, the real events and their historical personages. Pushkin and Tolstoy were aware of this. In depicting real events, Tolstoy tried "to be true to reality even to the smallest detail" (L. Tolstoy, "Poln. Sobr.



Soch.," vol 35, Moscow, 1950, p 614). Actually, historians should not exaggerate the virtues of facts, for it is true that "our virtues are most frequently artfully disguised faults (La Rochefoucauld).

One thing is clear: whereas the truthful presentation of our time requires a knowledge of life itself, the reflection of previous ages presumes knowledge based on history, books and primary sources. Hence the requirement of familiarity with the foundations of the methodology of history and the method of using sources in order not to become entrapped by documents or long obsolete concepts. This is the main thing and the historian has no right to make any other particular demand of the artist.

A discussion on historicism would be incomplete without mentioning the preservation of ancient monuments. In this area, despite tremendous successes achieved in recent years, many urgent problems remain. In welcoming the publication of the almanac "Monuments of the Fatherland" (1980), USSR Academy of Sciences President A. P. Aleksandrov said: "The information provided on past events, as found in the monuments, is not only of cognitive interest. Like a genetic code, it greatly predetermines the future." Why is it then that we occasionally witness the bad paradox of collecting and preserving monuments paralleled by dismantling entire sections of domestic museums. More than ever before, today we need museums in which young people can gain an understanding of the change which the October Revolution made in life. Are all areas of our culture doomed to undergo the stage of vulgar nihilism relative to the pre-Soviet past of the homeland?

It is being said that some parts of Soviet history must be strengthened. But why must one be done at the expense of the other, for we combine the Soviet with the patriotic. Museums should not be closed down inside but developed on the outside. This is needed precisely now, when the popularity of the treasures of our multinational culture is fast growing abroad thanks to our museums, the Hermitage above all. We are also pleased to note that the importance of Russia itself, of long standing to world history and the Russian topic in the world of thoughts and characters of foreign men of culture have been so strikingly brought to life in the works of Soviet scientists. Particularly great in this area are the contributions of the schools headed by V. N. Lazarev, M. P. Alekseyev and D. S. Likhachev. The time has come to undertake the systematic identification and registration of all foreign monuments of culture and history pertaining to Russia, from the Rhunic stones of Scandinavia to the manuscripts in Mount Athos, from the memorable sites related to the Russian navigators, scientists, writers and painters to Russian graves and from areas of activity of our revolutionaries to Vuchetich's memorials. Such scientifically drafted and illustrated catalogues will bring to light in an original and beautiful manner the great educational, revolutionary and liberating mission of progressive domestic culture.

Unlike others, we do not need to prove our European spirit by erecting in our capital a pseudo-Gothic temple and equip its ruins with Romanesque cellars. We have our own Vladimir-Suzdal white-stone architecture and the Italian traditions of the Renaissance in the Kremlin; nor do we need to buy from England old bridges and castles and erect them at the edge of the prairies.

Nor do we need to add to our universities "Victorian" window dressings. All we have to do is remember that Anna, the daughter of Yaroslav the Wise, as queen of France built a temple in Senlis not far from Paris, that to this day the monastery of Yakov and Gertruda stands in Regensburg, built by monks with donations made by 11th-century Kiev princes, and that the last pretender to the Austrian Babenberg legacy, the Galician Prince Roman Danilovich hid in a medieval castle in Himberg near Vienna....

We cherish the old stones of Europe, whose temples were lit with Russian wax and whose masters proudly wore their sables.

A Europe protected from the nomads by the ancient Russian sword.

A Europe whose humanistic traditions were enriched by the powerful upsurge of 19-20th-century Russian culture.

History cannot be outwitted.

Naturally, Russia's past has many unique features: the conquest of Eurasia, from the Danube to the Pacific and the traditions of Mikul' Selyaninovich, Afanasiy Nikitin, Yermak, Dezhnev...the polycentrism and polyethnic structure of the ancient Rus state; hundreds of years of liberation struggle against invasions from the West and the East; the unification of the ancient Rus lands as the way to the establishment of a centralized Great Russian state; the lack of overseas colonies and of a developed ideology of colonialism and colonial-racist traditions in culture, which largely explains Russia's popularity throughout the world; the tremendous contribution made to the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Europe; the outstanding role of the huge peasant wars in the history of the class struggle of the peasantry on the continent; finally, the universal historical importance of the homeland of Leninism in the global proletarian movement.

These unique features have left their mark on all realms of life and demand of us a clear class and party-oriented approach to our evaluations. Otherwise we would be unable to understand the greatness of what was created by Pushkin, Tolstoy, Dostoyevskiy, Saltykov-Shchedrin, Solov'yev and Klyuchevskiy or, briefly, anyone who was able to reflect to the extent of his own talent Russia's progress on the way to social harmony. The history of Russia is immeasurably broader than the history of tourism. Our culture lived through historical searches imbued with patriotism and social justice. It would have been impossible to create in Russia Rodin's brilliant monument "The Citizens of Callais" or to have its Nietzsche and Kipling. However, it had Vereshchagin's "Apotheosis of War" and the people remembered even from lost wars the defenders of the bastions of Sevastopol, who died one after the other but did not surrender, the monument to the exploit of the Russian seamen of the destroyer "Stereigushchiy" in Leningrad and the proudly fluttering flag of the sunken cruiser "Varyag."

History is so incredibly complex that it would be terrible for a historian to think that he has been deprived of the friendship of the arts, even for a moment. He would remember a pitiful "learned rusk" like the one described by

F. Mehring in discussing Marx's friendship with the arts (see F. Mehring, "Karl Marks. Istoriya Yego Zhizni" [Karl Marx. The Story of Life]. Moscow, 1957, p 27). For even the best historians struggle with the difficult problem of blending in an organic description the way people made history with a synthesizing structure expressed in contemporary scientific terms.

It is no accident that the research topics in history and literature are drawing closer to each other in the aspiration to bring to light patterns through institutions and people, with their thoughts, moods and feelings.

Nor is it an accident that, particularly among historians familiar with sources, a scientific intuition is growing along with their wish to work together with psychologists. Particularly needed today would be a popular historical journal and a topic collection on "History and the Writer." Our strength lies in our alliance with the muses. By sacredly preserving Lenin's standards of historicism we can fulfill our common duty of creating for the sake of man and his future.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## SOVIET TRADE UNIONS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR PEACE

AU121430 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84)  
pp 93-104

[Article by S. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU Presidium]

[Text] The key tasks of our time are to preserve and strengthen peace and prevent a new destructive war. The Leninist policy of peace, consistently implemented by the CPSU and the Soviet state, corresponds to the vital interests of the working people, all Soviet people and other peoples in the world. The extraordinary February Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized the continuity of our party's political course of strengthening peace and delivering mankind from the threat of a world nuclear war. "And we resolutely declare," Comrade K. U. Chernenko, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed at the plenum, "that we will not retreat from this policy by a single step." At the same time, he noted, "we will also continue to take care in the future to strengthen our country's defense capability and to have sufficient resources at our disposal to be able to cool the hotheads of military adventurists."

The danger of a nuclear war hanging over the world as a result of the aggressive policy of the reactionary imperialist circles of the United States and its NATO allies has stirred broad masses of the working people of all countries and continents, people of different races and nations and of different ideologies and world outlooks, to struggle for peace. Never in history has there been such a large social movement as the antiwar and antimilitarist movement has become today.

### I

The international trade union movement represents a great force whose influence in the processes of the world's social development is becoming increasingly significant. The very nature of trade unions as the greatest mass organizations of working people, the nature of their activity and the tasks which they are expected to carry out objectively predetermine their deep devotion to the cause of preserving peace. The antiwar traditions of the international workers movement began to take shape in the very first steps of the class struggle of the proletariat. It is by virtue of its social and political position in society that the workers class is in no way interested in war. The causes of wars inherent in the social system of capitalism are absolutely alien to the working people. And, what is even more, they are



contrary to the basic interests and goals of the workers class and its organizations which not only fail to derive any benefits whatsoever from war, but also suffer in wars the greatest human and material losses. On the other hand, it is only under the conditions of peace that the vital interests of the working people and the entire spectrum of their rights, including primarily the right to life, to creative work, and to social guarantees, can be fulfilled to the fullest extent.

Proceeding from all this, K. Marx and F. Engels concluded that as a result of the victory of socialism, the workers class would put an end to wars because the hostile relations between nations would decline simultaneously with the decline of antagonism between classes within a nation, and that a new society would be born "whose international principle would be PEACE since every people would have the same owner, LABOR" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 17, p 5). V. I. Lenin repeatedly stressed that wars bring disaster and suffering to the working people and create the danger of undermining the "very conditions of the human society's existence," because the "mightiest technical achievements are employed in war on such a large scale, so destructively, and with such energy for the mass annihilation of millions of human lives" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 36, p 396). The workers class, Lenin pointed out, is the social force which is capable of effectively struggling against imperialism and against the aggressive and reactionary wars engendered by imperialism. "The proletarian socialist revolution alone," he wrote, "can lead mankind out of the blind alley created by imperialism and imperialist wars" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 38, p 87).

As a result of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the class interests of the working people were incorporated for the first time in history in the foundations of the policy of the world's first state of workers and peasants. This was strikingly and clearly demonstrated by the first legislative act of Soviet Russia, the historic Decree on Peace which resolutely denounced imperialist war as the greatest crime against mankind. The principles of democratic peace proclaimed by the Leninist decree were indissolubly linked with the ideas of proletarian internationalism. The basic ideas of the decree contributed enormously to awakening the consciousness of the largest strata of the working people of Soviet Russia and of other countries and to mobilizing them to act for peace.

From the very first months of the existence of the land of the soviets, its trade unions closely combined their actions against the imperialist war and for the establishment of stable democratic peace with the struggle to strengthen the international solidarity of working people and the international unity of action of the workers class. Setting itself the task of contributing to reviving the international trade union movement which had been destroyed by World War I and, in particular, to convening an international congress of trade unions, the All-Russian Congress and Conference of Trade Unions, as early as in 1918, declared themselves in favor of such a congress discussing the question of intensifying the struggle of the working class of belligerent countries against imperialism and imperialist war and the question of establishing the unity of action of the working people for

that purpose. At the Hague congress in 1922, the Soviet trade union representatives proposed a concrete antiwar action program of trade unions. The AUCCTU subsequently proposed the convening of a joint conference of trade union organizations affiliated with the Trade Union International and the Amsterdam International\* to work out a program of actions against the danger of war and the fascist reaction. The Soviet trade unions repeatedly confirmed their proposal later on also. However, the proposal failed to gain support among the trade union organizations in the leading capitalist countries regardless of the fact that the world situation was becoming increasingly alarming as a result of the activities of the reactionary forces of imperialism and its shock detachments represented by the German fascism and the Japanese militarists.

The Soviet trade unions participated most actively in preparing and holding the International Peace Congress in Brussels (in 1936), the largest of the measures of this kind taken in the interwar period. Speaking at the congress, N. M. Shvernik, AUCCTU secretary, emphasized that "without trade unions there can be no effective international action against warmongers."

During World War II, the Soviet trade unions accomplished a great deal to activate the actions of popular masses in the countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition with the aim of crushing fascism as quickly as possible.

The Leninist formulation of the policy question of peace as the cause of all working people has been especially clearly and convincingly demonstrated in our period when the widest social forces and movements in all continents of the earth have joined the active struggle for peace and for preventing a nuclear war which threatens the world with countless disasters. The struggle for peace and against the threat of war has been and continues to be one of the most important tasks in the activities of the Soviet trade unions, our country's largest mass social organization, which unites more than 134 million working people in its ranks. The USSR trade unions accept the tasks set in the struggle for peace by the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of the Central Committee of our party as well as in Comrade K. U. Chernenko's speech to voters on 2 March, as their very own cause and as a concrete program of practical actions in the interests of the people of labor throughout the world. The principles of our foreign policy outlined by Comrade K. U. Chernenko have evoked a wide response among the working people and peoples of the entire world.

The USSR trade unions have actively participated in the contemporary world movement of defenders of peace from the very first days of its existence and they contribute in all possible ways to fulfilling its noble goals. Thus,

---

\* The Trade Union International [The Red International of Trade Unions]--the international union of revolutionary trade unions that existed from 1921 to 1937 and with which the Soviet trade unions were also affiliated. The Amsterdam Trade Union International [The International Trade Union Federation]--the organization of reformist trade unions that was founded by the Amsterdam congress in 1919. It was dissolved in 1945.

the Soviet trade unions extensively participated in collecting signatures for the Stockholm appeal of the Permanent Committee of the World Peace Congress on banning nuclear weapons as well as in other initiatives of the Committee, and in the movement for banning nuclear tests and for completely banning nuclear weapons, and for developing international relations on the basis of the principles of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems. The trade unions of the USSR and of the fraternal countries of socialism resolutely supported the policy of detente, which fully corresponds to the vital interests of all working people. Trade union representatives of the socialist states participated in the assemblies of European social forces in Brussels in 1972 and 1975 and in the work of the World Congress of Peace-Loving Forces and the World Forum of Peace-Loving Forces held in Moscow in 1973 and 1977, respectively. The Soviet trade unions, like all peace-loving forces, received with great satisfaction the results of the Helsinki CSCE session which concluded with the signing of the Final Act, that true charter of peaceful coexistence.

All decisions of the Soviet trade union congresses and the leading organs of our country's trade union movement clearly and invariably reflect the policy of an irreconcilable rejection of war as a means of solving disputes and express the aspiration to strengthen the unity of action of the world trade union movement in the struggle against militarist and arms race and for eliminating the threat of nuclear war. As is known, all these issues have assumed special significance and current importance in our time, when the aggressive militarist policy of the imperialist states, headed by the United States, has caused a sharp deterioration of the international situation. The sharp edge of the policy followed by the imperialist forces is directed at undermining the positions of all liberation movements of the contemporary period and, first and foremost, the positions of the community of socialist states as the main barrier in the way of imperialism's attempts to restore its world domination. Following the policy of preparing for a nuclear war, the reactionary imperialist circles also calculate that the situation of confrontation on the world scene accompanying these preparations will be able meanwhile to prevent a further strengthening of the position of real socialism and undermine its economic and social stability.

The quite definite "domestic front" calculations of the state and monopolist capitalist circles, that is, their hopes that they will succeed in slowing down or even reversing the process of social and economic destabilization of the capitalist society, which is characteristic of the present stage of deepening general crisis of capitalism, are also connected with this policy. Stakes are placed on the expectation that, under the conditions of international tension and using the demagogic slogans of "all-national unity" for counteractions against a mythical "Soviet military threat," the monopolies will be able to carry out more successfully their offensive against democratic and trade union freedoms and against the vital rights and interests of the working people of their own countries and to transfer to their shoulders all the costs of crisis difficulties of the capitalist system. In this way, the profoundly reactionary global strategy of the aggressive forces of imperialism, opposing the objective progress of world development, encroaches both upon the historical achievements of the working people of socialist stages



and upon the vital interests and social achievements of the peoples of non-socialist countries.

The antiwar and antimilitarist movement that has spread throughout the world, which has assumed unprecedented proportions in Western Europe, and is becoming increasingly widespread in the United States, has turned into a convincing answer of the broad popular masses to the imperialist policy of war preparations and increasing arms race. Striving to reduce the heat of antiwar actions, the opponents of peace and disarmament are increasingly frequently and persistently counting on a split and disintegration of the antiwar movements and are trying to gain control over some part of the movement in order to use it for a purpose contrary to the real interests of preservation of peace. Attempts are also being made at forming fragmentary organizations overtly acting under antiwar slogans but essentially aiming at disorienting the participants of the mass antiwar movement, at undermining and splitting it and at turning it into a tool in the struggle against the countries of socialism.

One of the most important tasks facing the participants of the antiwar movement today is to oppose these splitting tactics with the unity of action of all peace-loving forces and to refrain from weakening the intensity of the struggle against the plans of the imperialist reaction that threaten the very future of mankind.

## II

An increase in the active participation of trade unions in the antiwar movement is a noticeable trend of recent period. It reflects a deep anxiety and concern of the working people over the intensifying threat of nuclear war and over the arms race that continues at an accelerated rate on the one hand, and a growing awareness of trade union organizations in various countries of their responsibility for preserving and strengthening peace in the world, on the other.

The appeal to the working people and trade unions of the world adopted by the 17th Congress of the USSR Trade Unions expresses the will of the Soviet people to defend peace and protect the first and foremost right of man, the right to life. "The 17th Congress of the USSR Trade Unions," the appeal says, "declares: there is nothing more important than peace and the road to it does not lead through confrontation and arms race but through cooperation and political dialogue between the states with different social systems, through a frank and honest search for mutually acceptable solutions." The congress appealed to the people of labor of the entire world "with all the force of workers' solidarity to bar the road to the ruinous arms race and to take resolute joint action against the forces of aggression and militarism that threaten to push mankind to the brink of a thermonuclear catastrophe." The AUCCTU and the trade union central committees and councils have been charged with the task of continuing to struggle for developing in all possible ways the action unity of the working people and trade unions of all countries in the struggle to avert the threat of war and end the arms race and for disarmament and a broad cooperation between states with different social systems.



The questions of international solidarity of the working people in the struggle against the threat of war and for strengthening peace and curbing the arms race occupy the most important place in all contacts of the Soviet trade unions with foreign trade unions. In this connection our efforts are specifically made along the following basic directions:

First, promoting in every possible way the implementation of the Peace Program for the 1980s outlined by the 26th CPSU Congress, and of the peaceful initiatives of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the initiatives that open up the real road to preventing a new war and ending the arms race and to disarmament.

Second, systematically unmasking the myth of the imperialist propaganda about the "Soviet military threat," revealing the real causes of exacerbated international tension, and bringing to the broad masses of the working people abroad an understanding of the real dangers of the arms race imposed by imperialism as well as an understanding of the social reasons for the arms race and of its incompatibility with the fundamental and vital interests of the people of labor. Third, regularly and convincingly unmasking the insolvency and falsehood of the bourgeois propagandists' claims about the supposed beneficial effect of the arms race on the socioeconomic position of the working people of the capitalist countries and demonstrating with factual materials evidence that these "theories" serve only the interests of big monopolies and the military-industrial complex for which the manufacturing of weapons is an advantageous business that yields greater profits when tension is higher and the spiral in the arms race is steeper. Fourth, consistently continuing to follow the policy of strengthening the action unity of trade unions and the entire international trade union movement in the struggle against military threats, for peace and disarmament.

The Soviet trade unions are constantly fulfilling all these tasks in various forms of their activities. Thus, our country's trade union organizations have organized or actively participated in all antiwar measures that have taken place in the USSR in recent years. The Day of Trade Union Peace Actions observed annually on 1 September in conformity with the appeal of the 10th World Trade Union Congress occupies a special place in mass actions of the working people against the threat of war. The observation of that day in 1982 and 1983 clearly demonstrated the existence of a large antiwar potential in the activities of trade unions in various countries.

The Day of Trade Union Peace Actions is widely observed in the socialist countries. On that day, mass antiwar meetings and rallies are held and war and labor veterans are honored in the Soviet Union. Labor peace watches are organized in large enterprises. At the initiative of labor collectives, a portion of the funds earned on that day is allotted to the Soviet Peace Fund. The new school year, which begins in the country's schools and the professional technical school institutions on 1 September, now opens with peace lectures. The scope of the measures carried out in the USSR in connection with the Day of Trade Union Peace Actions is convincingly demonstrated by the fact that, in 1983, about 60 million Soviet working people participated in these measures, expressing their complete support for and approval of the peace-loving foreign political course of the CPSU and the Soviet state.

Participants of the mass meetings emphasized in their adopted resolutions that the honest and conscientious work and the successful fulfillment of production plans by every individual worker and every individual labor collective represent a concrete contribution of our country's working people to the struggle for peace. The Soviet people everywhere have closely linked their sincere aspiration for peace with the tasks of implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress and the subsequent plenums of the party Central Committee.

The Soviet trade unions also consider it very important that delegations of foreign trade union organizations participate in the measures taken in our country in connection with the Day of Trade Union Peace Actions. Thus, on that day in 1983, trade union representatives from more than 60 countries, including the United States, Great Britain, France, and Australia, were our guests. This fact invests the implementation of these measures with the character of an international trade union action, demonstrates the unity of interests of the working people of various countries, and enables our foreign colleagues to convince themselves with their own eyes of the falsehood of the bourgeois propaganda fantasies about the "Soviet military threat" and to feel the Soviet people's sincere aspiration for peace.

The new initiative of our country's trade unions is to hold annual mass antiwar events in Moscow with the participation of the foreign trade union delegations arriving here for the May Day festivities at the AUCCTU's invitation. International antiwar meetings of friendship and solidarity of Moscow working people together with trade union representatives of more than 100 countries have been held already twice in the Hall of Columns of the Trade Union Palace. Such a meeting will also be held on 2 May this year. The international trade union conferences held during the sojourn of foreign trade union delegations in the USSR for May Day celebrations are also becoming traditional. The problems of the struggle for peace hold a central place in the work of these conferences. The forthcoming conference in May 1984 will also be devoted to these questions. Its topic will be "Trade Unions in the Struggle for Vital Interests of the Working People and Against the Threat of a New War."

The problems of the struggle for peace and disarmament and against the arms race have an important place in the bilateral relations which the Soviet trade unions now maintain with trade unions in 145 states of the world. Several thousand trade union delegations from socialist, capitalist and developing countries visit the USSR every year; more than 600 Soviet delegations go abroad every year. It is in the course of these contacts with various forms of approach in solving the currently important problems of antiwar struggle are developed.

Mass trade union meetings, which are an effective instrument of cooperation in the antiwar struggle, are becoming increasingly firmly established in the practice of our relations with the trade unions of capitalist countries.

For instance, the mass Soviet-Finnish trade union rallies that have been held since 1969 and are devoted to important dates in the life of our two countries have a long and rich tradition. One such regular rally was held

simultaneously in both countries in April 1983 and was devoted to the 35th anniversary of the Treat of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance between the USSR and Finland. Its participants adopted a joint appeal to the trade unions of the European continent entitled "For a Peaceful, Nuclear-Free Europe!"

Bilateral cooperation with the Japanese trade unions continues to develop successfully. In the summer of 1982, a large group of that country's trade union activists participated in antiwar meetings held in Moscow, Leningrad, Minsk, Khabarovsk and Volgograd. The antiwar pledge of the Soviet and Japanese working people was made at the Piskarevskiy cemetery in Leningrad. The regular 14th Soviet-Japanese mass trade union rally "For Peace and Friendship Between the Peoples of Japan and the Soviet Union" was successfully held in the USSR in August and September 1983. The session of the Soviet-Japanese Trade Union Permanent Commission held in Tokyo in January this year outlined the plan of further development of cooperation between the trade unions of our two countries.

In recent years, the Soviet trade unions received large groups of working people and trade union activists, each consisting of 100 to 320 members, from Australia, the FRG, and Scotland. A peace and friendship train organized at the initiative of trade unions arrived in the Soviet Union from France for the first time in the summer of 1983. Interesting meetings, international friendship rallies and discussions on currently important international problems are held in various cities and enterprises during the visits of mass groups of foreign working people to our country. These forms of international trade union contacts open up new possibilities for further activating joint actions in the defense of peace.

Questions of trade and economic relations occupy an ever more prominent place in bilateral relations with the Western trade unions. Being an important factor in interstate contacts, a form of peaceful communication between peoples and a material basis for their spiritual cooperation, trade and economic relations also have a significant social effect which is reflected primarily in their direct effect upon increasing employment in the Western countries and thereby also in preserving and increasing the number of work places in these countries. This has great significance for the working people of the West under the conditions of growing unemployment in the capitalist world. In addition, interstate economic cooperation clearly embodies an antimilitarist alternative of international economic development and makes it possible to accumulate the experience of multilateral economic interaction which is so valuable and essential for jointly resolving mankind's global problems. Dialogue on questions of trade and economic cooperation contributes to revealing the mutual interest of the trade unions in restoring a climate of detente. This is testified to, for example, by the experience accumulated during the many years of work by the Soviet-Finnish Trade Union Permanent Commission, and also by the French-Soviet trade union seminar held in Paris in November 1983, which was specially devoted to questions of trade and economic cooperation. The Soviet trade unions regard the further development of this cooperation as being an important contribution to the struggle to strengthen peace and to restore a climate of detente.



The Soviet trade unions actively participate in preparing and carrying out large-scale multilateral trade union measures concerning problems of the antiwar struggle and the socioeconomic aspects of the arms race. They have been among the initiators of these measures which have taken place during the course of world forums of peace-loving forces.

The international "round table" meeting of trade union figures, conducted within the framework of the World Parliament of Peoples for Peace (Sofia, September 1980), was a significant event in the world trade union movement. Representatives of trade unions of various persuasions from 83 countries participated in this meeting. The meeting played an important role in preparing the World Trade Union Conference on the Socioeconomic Aspects of Disarmament, held in Paris in December 1981, which was one of the major international antiwar trade unions actions of recent years. The Paris conference, in which representatives of 115 trade unions belonging to various international trade union organizations--the WFTU, the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions and the General Confederation of Labor--from 62 countries, and also 23 international trade union and other organizations, including the United Nations, the ILO and UNESCO took part, was an important stage in the development of the struggle of the trade unions for peace and disarmament.

An extensive international trade union meeting was held in the summer of 1983 in Prague during the World Assembly "For Peace and Life, Against Nuclear War." Approximately 500 representatives of trade unions from 82 countries unanimously confirmed their ardent striving to do everything to defend peace on earth. The international trade union meeting-dialogue "Peace and the Trade Unions," held in Sofia in October of last year, the preparation and conduct of which the Soviet trade unions actively participated in, also aroused a great international response to the trade union movement. Representatives of 108 trade unions from 72 countries participated in this meeting.

As is well-known, as a result of the policy pursued by the right-wing leadership of the American trade union organization, the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, and also by the U.S. State Department, which refuses entry visas to our representatives, contacts between the trade unions of the USSR and the United States, especially in recent years, have been made essentially difficult. The experience of trade union delegations from the two countries jointly participating in the series of meetings "East and West: Dialogue in the Name of Peace," organized by the Danish trade unions in November 1982 was all the more interesting and revealing. The open discussions held in Denmark's four largest cities on topical problems of the antiwar struggle aroused immense interest among the working people of this country. All in all, more than 5,000 Danes attended the discussions, which culminated in an extensive antiwar conference and the adoption of a joint Danish-Soviet-American document appealing to trade unions to act in the defense of peace.

Two large international trade union conferences were held in the Soviet Union in 1983. The 24th Workers' Conference of the Baltic countries, Norway and



Iceland was held in Tallinn at the beginning of June. It was preceded by a voyage of a ship of peace in the Baltic Sea, during the courses of which mass international antiwar meetings and other measures organized by the local trade unions were held in Leningrad (USSR), Rostock (GD), Kiel (FRG), Oslo (Norway), Copenhagen (Denmark), Gothenburg (Sweden) and Helsinki (Finland). The World Trade Union Conference on the Socioeconomic Aspects of Disarmament in the Energy Branches of Industry was held in Moscow in August. It determined the tasks of the trade unions in the struggle for peace and the use of the energy branches of industry for creative and peaceful purposes. In this connection it must be said that the Soviet trade unions attach great significance to antiwar trade union activity at the branch level, since it is here that problems of the struggle for peace center upon concrete socioeconomic problems common to the working people of the given branch, which creates the necessary prerequisites for their joint activities.

### III

The trade unions have always been consistent and active advocates of the broadest unity of action of the working people in the antiwar struggle. In the conditions of the increased aggressiveness of reactionary imperialist circles and of their obvious striving to coordinate their activities, the significance of joint actions by trade unions of various persuasions, actions aimed at wrecking the plans of the military dangerous to the cause of peace, has increased still further. It is precisely from this that the Soviet trade unions proceeded when, as early as October 1979, they circulated the AUCCTU's Memorandum at the Third European Trade Union Conference, in which the leaders of central trade union organizations of various persuasions, representing all the major trends in the international trade union movement, participated. This memorandum contained the proposal to come to an agreement on concrete joint actions by trade unions of various countries in the struggle against the military danger and against attempts to return the world to the "cold war" period and to impose a new round of the arms race upon the peoples. The Soviet trade union declared their willingness to participate most actively in initiatives taken by central trade union organizations in any country in this sphere. Our proposal gained particular significance in view of the NATO Council's adoption 2 months later of the decision to deploy new American nuclear missiles in a number of West European countries.

Two years later at the next European Trade Union Conference, questions connected with this decision, which increases the danger to the cause of peace, were already the subject of thorough discussion. The participants in the conference declared themselves in favor of reaching an agreement on liquidating all nuclear weapons deployed in Europe and aimed at Europe, during the course of the Soviet-American Geneva talks. Unfortunately, the stand taken by the right-wing leadership of the West European central trade union organizations in connection with the events in Poland prevented backing up the adopted decisions with concrete joint efforts and actions on the part of the European trade unions.

In October 1982, the AUCCTU once again appealed to the trade union centers of Western Europe saying, in particular: "The trade unions of our countries operate under the conditions of different social systems. They take

different stands on many questions. But we are convinced that all prejudices must be cast aside and differences overlooked when the matter concerns the most important problem of our time--the preservation of peace." The AUCCTU appealed to the trade unions of all European countries to carry out mass antiwar actions demanding that the arms race be stopped, negotiations on intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Europe be constructively concluded, further deployment forbidden, and the number of missiles on the European continent reduced. At a meeting in Berlin on 30 September 1983 the leaders of central trade union organizations of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Romania, the USSR and CSSR adopted a joint appeal to all trade unions and working people in Europe, calling upon them to activate the struggle for peace and disarmament and against the deployment of new American nuclear missiles on the European continent.

The consistent course pursued by the Soviet trade unions and the trade union organizations in fraternal socialist countries to activate the antiwar struggle, which is finding an ever broader response among the working people in the West European countries, has led to certain positive changes in the position of the West European trade union organizations. The problems of the struggle for the preservation and strengthening of peace, against the arms race and for disarmament have begun to occupy a more prominent place in the program documents, decisions and resolutions of the national central trade union organizations and branch trade unions in the capitalist countries.

It must be said, however, that even now many aspects of these problems are far from always being treated with the proper objectivity and depth, and that there is an obvious touch of anti-Sovietism and anticommunism in the approach to these problems. As before, it is difficult for the trade union associations in the West to overcome the incorrect assessments of the causes of the exacerbation of the international situation which are imposed upon them by the bourgeois mass information media. For example, one frequently comes across the false thesis about the so-called "equal responsibility of the superpowers" for the continuing arms race. But even allowing for all this, there is no doubt that a visible positive change is taking place within the trade union movement of the capitalist world in its approach to problems of the antiwar struggle and in its evaluation of the role, place and potentials of the trade unions in this struggle.

Today the struggle for peace is proclaimed as one of the central tasks of the trade unions in the program of the West German trade union association--the German Trade Union Federation (ONP)--and in the resolutions of the congresses of the British trade unions and the central trade union organizations of Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and many other countries.

A fundamental change has also appeared in the positions of the international trade union organizations.

As far as the largest of them is concerned, the WFTU (VFP), which unites trade unions of socialist, liberated and capitalist states on a class and anti-imperialist basis, it has always consistently and persistently striven for peace and disarmament, and for the development of the process of detente

and cooperation between peoples. And it is no accident that all the world trade union congresses held between 1945 and 1982 have been important landmarks in the antiwar movement of the working people the world over. Regarding the deployment of American missiles which has begun in Western Europe, the WFTU has decisively condemned this aggressive step and demanded the cessation of their installation and the removal of the transoceanic missiles already located on the European continent as a necessary condition for the resumption of the Geneva talks.

The attitude of the ICFTU (MKSP), which is under the influence of social democrats, toward the problems of peace and disarmament has undergone appreciable change since the time of the ICFTU's founding. For a long time, the ICFTU openly supported the militarization of Western Europe, the aggressive aspirations of NATO, and the imperialist policy of the Western powers as a whole. In the 1970s, the ICFTU began to show a more realistic approach in its appraisals of currently important international problems, including the struggle for peace and disarmament. The high level of activeness of broad strata of the working people organized in trade unions in antiwar actions undoubtedly influenced this process. Following the previous line in its official policy under the new conditions would show the ICFTU leadership as lagging behind the masses and being alienated from the real processes taking place in the national trade union organizations affiliated with the ICFTU. As a result of this, the ICFTU leaders have been compelled to increasingly definitely declare themselves against the arms race, in favor of banning nuclear weapons and for disarmament. The resolutions of the 13th congress of that organization, which was held in 1983, emphasizes that the struggle for peace is the main political problem. The congress announced the ICFTU's commitment to contribute to solving international conflicts through negotiations and agreements and to advocate the search for solutions that will open up the possibilities for reducing the strategic and "Eurostrategic" arsenals of the USSR and the United States and for forming and expanding nuclear-free zones. However, regardless of an appreciable revision of its former position, the ICFTU has retained in its approach to the questions of war and peace a considerable number of elements of its former policy. For instance, to satisfy the obsolete "cold war" dogmas, the ICFTU continues to interdict the participation of its member organizations in any events together with the WFTU and its affiliated organizations. At the same time, the ICFTU continues to contribute its bit to the anti-Soviet and antisocialist campaign unleashed in the West and to fanning the myth of a "Soviet military threat."

The World Confederation of Labor (VKT) which unites the so-called Christian trade unions, considers the struggle for peace and disarmament as a component part of the struggle to satisfy the vital needs of the working people. This position in itself appears to be similar to the position of the Soviet trade unions. However, the World Confederation of Labor proceeds from the claim that the arms race is allegedly engendered by the "competition between the two military blocs" and serves the purpose of "maintaining the existing situation in the world as well as the interests, prestige and influence of the superpowers." Distorting thereby the very objective reasons for the arms race, the World Confederation of Labor in fact puts the policy of the imperialist powers and the policy of the countries of the socialist community on the same level.



In their contacts with the central trade union organizations affiliated with the ICFTU and the World Confederation of Labor, the Soviet trade unions make no attempts to artificially hide the existing differences in the appraisals of and positions on questions of the antiwar struggle. In this connection they strive primarily to find the points of meeting and concurrence in these appraisals and, on this basis, to develop the difficult but necessary and important dialogue aimed at achieving coordinated actions of all trade unions in the struggle for peace and against the threat of a thermonuclear catastrophe.

It is precisely by these goals that the Soviet trade unions are guided in their work within the framework of the International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament, which was formed in May 1982. Being open to the admission of diverse trade union organizations, the nature of the committee makes it possible for the trade unions of different orientations and international affiliations to participate in its activities. Some 30 trade unions of the capitalist, socialist and liberated countries are now represented in the committee.

The intensification of trade union actions for peace is assuming a particular importance in our period when the situation in the world has been further exacerbated as a result of the deployment of the new American missiles in Western Europe. The imperialist propaganda and the advocates of the NATO "counterarming" try to present the deployment of the missiles as the "greatest victory of NATO unity" and of "Reagan's hard line." They want to instill in the public the idea that, you see, the antiwar movement "has lost the battle against the American missiles." Thereby an attempt is also being made at demobilizing the peace-loving forces and at weakening their antiwar potential primarily in Europe.

However, the maneuvers of this kind cannot hide the basic trend: antiwar feelings are continuing to grow. The antiwar struggle has yielded important positive results. It has changed the entire psychological atmosphere in Western Europe. The broadest strata that had formerly stayed far away from politics have actively joined the actions. It has made it possible to activate also the antinuclear movements in the United States, Japan, Canada and other regions of the world. Hundreds of thousands and millions of working people in Western Europe and the United States have participated in antiwar demonstrations, peace marches and manifestations in recent years. And all this cannot but lead to essential changes in the positions of the leadership of some or other trade union associations in Western countries. Thus, for instance, only 2 years ago the leadership of the West German central trade union organization, the German Trade Union Federation, supported the deployment of American missiles in the FRG. But in October last year, it had already organized a 5-minute general political action; that is, essentially, a 5-minute general political strike, in protest against this deployment. The mass manifestation held by the Swedish trade unions in Stockholm on 17 January 1984, the day of the opening of the Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe, clearly demonstrated the determination of the Swedish working people to defend the cause of peace and disarmament.



The antiwar movement of the masses played quite a considerable role in creating a situation in which the U.S. government was forced to come to the negotiating table on nuclear missiles in Geneva. In the subsequent period, the antiwar movement clearly demonstrated the will of the working people of European countries to end the dangerous nuclear arms race and renounce the deployment of American missiles on their continent. And this will continue to influence the political parties, parliaments and governments in West European countries.

The trade unions of socialist countries are unanimous in their principled appraisal of the existing international situation and of the causes of its sharp exacerbation. The opinion of the working people and all members of trade unions in our country in connection with the deployment of the new American missiles that has begun in Western Europe and the resolute condemnation of this new aggressive step of the imperialist circles of the United States and its NATO allies has been expressed in the corresponding statement issued by the AUCCTU Presidium.

Having lost hopelessly in the ideological antagonism with socialism, the most aggressive circles of imperialism and primarily the Reagan administration, which has proclaimed a "crusade against communism," are striving to find a way out along the road of resolving the ideological disagreements with force and militarist pressures. But the reality of the contemporary period is such that whoever today threatens the Soviet Union or, let us say, the GDR, Czechoslovakia, or any other state of the socialist community must take into account not only their national economic and defense potentials, but the general united potential of the socialist community, the main bulwark of peace on earth.

Realizing the danger which the adventurist course of imperialism represents for mankind, the working people and the trade unions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries look to the future with confidence, knowing the enormous potentials of their states. They see their main international duty toward their class brothers throughout the world in working to multiply these potentials. In the difficult international situation, they are intensifying their activity in mobilizing the working people of their countries for shock labor and for successfully fulfilling the national economic plans to ensure the material basis of the economic and defense might of the countries of the socialist community.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/11

## COMMUNISTS AND THE NEW SOCIAL PROTEST MOVEMENTS

AU110700 Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84)  
pp 105-115

[Article by Yu. Krasin, doctor of philosophical sciences, and B. Leybzon, doctor of historical sciences]

[Text] Mankind is experiencing a complex period in its history. Because of the aggressive imperialist forces, the threat of nuclear destruction now hangs over the world.

But however great this threat may be, its fulfillment is by no means inevitable. There are forces in the world capable of barring the way to war. These forces are the countries of real socialism, the organized workers movement, the many nonaligned states and the broad democratic movements. The struggle for peace is becoming the main struggle in the activities of the international communist movement. "Communists," it was said at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "have always fought against the oppression and exploitation of man by man, and today they are also fighting for the preservation of human civilization and for man's right to life."

The imminent threat of a totally destructive nuclear war is of a class nature: It is the result of imperialism. The struggle against this threat is now assuming the nature of a cause common to all mankind, and every individual is prepared to defend his right to life. Working people make up the overwhelming majority of mankind. The progressive class of the era, the international working class, is called upon to lead the struggle to preserve peace and human civilization. An ever broader alliance of heterogeneous class and social forces which adhere to various political views and world outlooks is taking shape around this class.

The circle of allies of the working class continues to expand. A multitude of nontraditional organizations appeared in the developed capitalist countries in the 1970s--autonomous social protest movements distinguished by their great originality and encompassing broad circles of the population. The nature and rapid growth of these movements make it possible to speak of a new phenomenon in the social and political life of the bourgeois states. The movements are varied both in scale and in the forms of their activities. The range of their struggle is extremely broad--from trying to participate in resolving problems which are customarily considered global to acting in defense of the interests of the inhabitants of a particular street or block.

At first the new social movements were regarded as something transient. However, becoming convinced of their "tenacity," bourgeois ideologist and politicians are striving to direct the movements' energy for social protest into a channel which is safe for them. They are also not loath to using them as a special kind of counterweight to the workers movement.

Although these movements go under different names--protest movements, new social movements (with or without quotation marks), popular movements, democratic movements--in the documents and publications of communist parties in capitalist countries, they are nevertheless regarded as real social forces that oppose the existing systems and objectively have a democratic nature.

What are the causes of the appearance of the new movements? Their most notable characteristic is that wherever they may appear and whatever immediate tasks they may set themselves, the striving to avert the mortal threat of a nuclear conflagration is inherent to them all. People refuse to reconcile themselves to the dark forces pushing the world to the brink of a thermonuclear war. And they protest. It is precisely in people's anxiety for the fate of the world that the main sources of the appearance of the new social movements lie.

Of course, antiwar movements have always existed, but they have never been on such a scale or of such a mass nature. The methods of struggle have become more varied. The threat of war, if it can be so expressed, arouses the sense of self-preservation which prompts one to act and to find more and more new methods of protesting against the domestic and foreign political course of reactionary imperialist circles in the capitalist states.

There are hundreds of antiwar groups and movements in every country (in addition to those which operate under the aegis of the World Peace Council). They exert a notable influence upon the political climate of contemporary Europe. Advocates of peace in Denmark, Holland and Belgium influenced their parliaments' decisions to postpone the deployment of American missiles. In spite of temporary failures and police repressions, the fervor of antiwar actions in England, the FRG and Italy is not weakening. Up to 3 million people continually and actively participate in these actions in the FRG. The rise of the antiwar movement angers the "war party"--a significant part of the country's ruling class and of the "intellectual" forces which serve it. For example, in the journal *EUROPAEISCHE WEHRKUNDE*, which is published by a military-political association, West German philosopher Guenter Schmidt does not hide his irritation over the scale of the peace movement. Trying to cast a shadow on the movement's motives, the aforementioned "scientist" ascribes "puritan fanaticism" to the advocates of peace. But even he cannot deny such causes of the intensification of the movement as distrust of the state and rejection of callousness and bureaucratism which, as is well-known, are born of the social conditions of contemporary bourgeois society. The author of the article is displeased with the fact that communists "are the most powerful, monolithic and active group in the 'peace movement' and a workhorse in this movement; it is true, as a whole, they are numerically in the minority, but to make up for this they have concrete and clear aims...."

The seventh congress of the German Communist Party (DKP) (January 1984) stated with good reason that, in embarking upon the deployment of new nuclear weapons in the FRG, the United States had thereby turned the greater part of the country's population against itself. "The peace movement," said Herbert Mies, DKP chairman, "has fundamentally changed the situation on the political scene of the FRG and, if it maintains its unity, broadens its ranks and continues the struggle with its former energy, it will also henceforth be an important factor in ensuring peace."

The struggle for peace, which rallies the different strata of the population together for the sake of a humane aim, has a tendency to develop into a struggle with a broader social content. The protest against nuclear war can, under certain conditions, also turn against the society which causes wars. Such are the dialectics.

The nature of the motives for protest, the nature of a cause common to all mankind, is not only characteristic of the actions of the advocates of peace, but also of ecological movements. The tasks which these movements set themselves answer a ripe social need--the need to protect the environment from the destructive consequences of the capitalist monopolies' rapacious utilization of natural resources.

It is precisely this task, together with the struggle for peace, which is put forward by the so-called "Greens" movement, which has recently gained not only broad public support, but also appreciable political successes. Speaking of the FRG, it is noted that the "Greens" have crossed the election barrier to the provincial parliaments in a short period of time, and in the last parliamentary elections they entered the Bundestag, where they immediately declared themselves to be resolutely opposed to the deployment of American intermediate-range missiles on the country's territory.

The "Greens" protest against nuclear weapons and the threat of their use, but, at the same time, they oppose the construction of nuclear power stations. At times they oppose technological production as a whole, which provides grounds for comparing them to the Luddites, who destroyed machines at the dawn of the workers movement. The ecological movements are marked by their ideological diversity, and the views of their participants are frequently of a utopian nature. One can hear assertions from among their ranks that an "ecological revolution" will supposedly eliminate the necessity for a social revolution. But for all the unrealizable nature of other projects of the "Greens," it is impossible not to see that their rapid and, for many, quite unexpected success in the political arena is explained by the energy, decisiveness and uncompromising and unusual nature of the forms of their struggle for antiwar aims. The fact that the "Greens" have become a political force with which the ruling circles must reckon has shown that the problems of peace and war directly affect the interests of each and every man.

The numerous movements of citizens' initiatives, which have become widespread in recent years, are of a somewhat different nature. They arose as a form of protest against the advancing process of the emasculation of democratic rights and the bureaucratization of the contemporary bourgeois state, and are



oriented toward resolving a broad range of problems of everyday life: housing leisure, children's education, means of communication, education systems, and many others. These movements unite apartment tenants protesting against exorbitantly high apartment rents and land speculation, advocates of temperance, people striving to obtain all the proper amenities in their district, and the homeless seizing vacant houses and apartments. They frequently unite their efforts to fulfill some concrete task, such as, let us say, building a children's playground for a residential district. The citizens' initiatives are frequently called a "one-cause" movement, but permanent organizations also arise which are guided by the principle, "What the state does not want to do the citizens must do themselves." A striving to "get by" without the state, and to be a little further away from the callousness and bureaucratism of its institutions is apparent in the citizens' initiatives. There is a tendency to unite separate groups of citizens' initiative on a city or even on a nationwide scale. Once again it is significant that such seemingly "inoffensive" movements as citizens' initiatives simply cannot remain indifferent to the most burning problem of the contemporary era in the face of the threat of the destruction of life itself on earth.

Many municipalities are declaring their cities nuclear-free zones, and the same decisions are being adopted by tenants with respect to their districts and even their homes. In practice, the struggle to preserve green grass plots sometimes becomes a movement of protest against the deployment of military objectives on this or that territory. More and more often citizens' initiatives are ceasing to be movements of "one dimension," and the logic of life brings them face to face with big political issues.

Protest against the bourgeois state has also given rise to movements which call themselves alternative movements. They reflect the masses' disillusionment with "consumer society" and its primitive values according to which the whole meaning of human existence is "not in being, but in possessing." Like the participants in the citizens' initiatives, but perhaps differing from them by their higher level of social awareness, the advocates of the alternative movements make demands upon the bourgeois state. They also do not wish to be reconciled to the arms race, to the corruption and lowering of the role of the electoral organs, to the growing influence of every kind of pressure group, and to the lobbying system which, in the United States for example, has become an unofficial law. The participants in many alternative movements strive to return to the "simple" way of life, to nature, and they form communes and struggle against the conventionalism of the official school and the lack of spirituality in culture. Basically, the term "alternative movements" is a collective one and signifies the sum total of actions aimed at changing the forms of human society. In the FRG alone there are more than 11,000 "alternative" projects to change social relations. Different and sometimes also incompatible outlooks and positions frequently exist within the alternative movements. This is one of the weaknesses which leads to endless debates about the movement's concept and strategy, sometimes ending with the "effect of self-paralysis"--the loss of the ability to act. Nonetheless, the common denominator of all these diverse movements of various levels of significance is criticism of the ruling system.

Much that is new has also appeared in the women's movements. Thus, together with the traditional demands for social and political equality and equal pay for equal work, voices defending the human dignity of women are being heard more and more strongly. Neofeminist movements have become active. In spite of the clearly antiscientific nature of some views or others of their representatives, it is impossible not to appraise as highly positive the role of these movements as a whole, especially their activeness and initiative in the struggle for nuclear disarmament and peace.

In many cases, it is precisely women who have been the initiators of mass peace marches, and the unprecedented siege by women of the American missile base at Greenham Common in England in the face of provocations and the use of water cannon, police truncheons and jail, can serve as a striking example of their persistence and resoluteness.

New phenomena are also observed in the youth movements. Society has not come up against the "crisis of youth," as bourgeois sociological literature sometimes claims, but has rather come into conflict with the youth of the crisis which capitalist society is itself experiencing. Some young people are gripped by a feeling of hopelessness, become drug addicts, and reinforce various terrorist groups. Morally decaying, bourgeois society drags the people with the weakest social ties after it into the quagmire. But, on the whole, the activeness of the younger generation is increasing. Young people make up the greater part of all contemporary social protest movements, come up with various initiatives and frequently initiate mass actions and antiwar demonstrations.

Public opinion polls and sociological research testify to the changes taking place in the consciousness of broad strata of the population. Without yet placing the exploitative system as a whole in doubt, as a result of the economic crisis, the growth of inflation and unemployment and the reduction in expenditures on social needs, an ever greater number of people are beginning to experience disillusionment with the notions of the imaginary merits and advantages of the bourgeois way of life imposed on them by false propaganda.

It is not only those strata of the population which have not found emancipation from economic difficulties in "consumer capitalism" which are now protesting. The intelligentsia and youth who do not want to reduce the meaning of life to consumerism, which is accompanied by the loss of moral values, are also protesting. As early as before World War II, a similar moral condition was described by the French writer and humanist Saint-Exupery: "...I begin to stifle in my room, which is crowded with a thousand objects of which I shall never have need and which I begin to hate as soon as they become mine. And still the mountain of my possessions grows every day. I am probably unconsciously making sacrifices to an unknown god."

One or 2 decades later the "unknown god" was given the name of "consumer society." How many pathetic words and affected raptures were lavished upon this deity by bourgeois propaganda! But the "consumer society" did not make man happier--on the contrary, it dehumanized him, turning him into a victim of advertisements. The same Exupery said that industry which is based upon

profit "strives to create people for chewing gum, and not chewing gum for people." Spiritual impoverishment and the cult of unlimited consumption make an ominous imprint in all aspects of life in contemporary capitalist society.

The rapid growth of the new social protest movements and of all kinds of social organizations and associations and the attempts of the man "on the street" to actively intervene in societal matters are more and more frequently becoming the object of attention of sociologists of various political persuasions. The Italian sociologist Alberto Mellucci, who is studying this topic, expresses the conviction, for example, that the social movements which have arisen in the society of "late capitalism" are the heralds of new antagonistic battles. In his turn, the Austrian Marxist W. Pertzinger notes that the exacerbation of contradictions of state-monopolistic capitalism is the motor of the protest movements, which are by no means short-lived. Certain sections of these movements "can become conscious participants in the anti-monopolistic struggle."

It is true that by virtue of the heterogeneity of the new social protest movements their sociopolitical direction does not always come to light immediately, and it is frequently concealed beneath a cloak of various individual demands. But the objective logic of the struggle makes it incumbent upon all these movements to review social relations in society. Observations show that people who participate in the new movements frequently have a very hazy idea of scientific socialism and of life in the countries of real socialism, and their political awareness is frequently burdened with anticommunist prejudices.

Because of the contradictory nature of the views of those participating in the movements, it is difficult to predict the development of these movements. During the process of their further growth, ideological-political differentiation is bound to take place within them.

And what is the social structure of the new movements? As has been noted, many of them are not yet properly formed organizations taking stock of their members, especially on matters of social affinity.

Western progressive researchers are of the opinion that a significant number of these movements are "multiclass in their nature." Indeed, representatives of practically all classes and social strata and people of various professions and ages participate in the antiwar movements.

There are workers, employees, scientists, students, religious workers and even some retired generals and people with origins in bourgeois circles. The composition of the ecological movements is equally heterogeneous. Paid workers predominate in these movements, which reflects the growing interest of the trade unions in environmental protection measures, and a large role is played by the intelligentsia. Organizations formed by citizen initiatives, which are frequently of a local nature, reflect, in their turn, the social composition of the population of various apartment areas, streets, and districts. The ranks of the alternative movements are almost completely filled by young people and the intelligentsia.



Thus, the new movements embrace broad circles of the population, and the most active among them are proving to be the middle strata, primarily in the cities: doctors, lawyers, writers, journalists and other cultural figures, engineers, small business owners whose main income is from their own work, and others. Unlike the "new left-wingers" of the 1960s, the social base of the contemporary movements is considerably broader and the range of problems with which they are concerned is more varied.

The growth of socioeconomic contradictions within the developed capitalist countries is opening up new possibilities for the working class and its revolutionary vanguard to develop cooperation with the social movements which have recently arisen. The time has passed, note West German communists, when the powers that be were able to brush aside these numerous democratic movements as "mobs of rioters" and "hooligans and madcaps." Now they must be reckoned with.

The discontent of these "rioters" with capitalist ways is usually accompanied by a growing disillusionment among them with the political parties and with the growth of mistrust of these parties. They regard these parties as the focus of bad politicians and careerists. The alienation of the new social movements from the bourgeois political institutions is spreading to the parties and to politics as a whole. This testifies to the fact that a leveling of parties in general, irrespective of their ideological direction, is strangely taking place in the consciousness of their participants. To a certain extent, this kind of reaction is also explainable by the inconsistent positions of progressive parties, including some communist ones, on acute problems of the contemporary era. It can perhaps be understood as a sort of "paying" for the opportunist sins permitted in the past, and sometimes also in everyday political practice. Communists must taken into account of this mistrust of parties as a political institution.

Communists by no means stand aside from the new social movements. In connection with their development, the congress of the German Communist Party in May 1981 emphasized quite definitely: "Opposition of the working class to the people's democratic movement would have fateful consequences. United the force of the workers class with the force of progressive political and social movements of our time--this is what is now important." But this task has to be fulfilled under complex conditions and in an atmosphere of increasing anticommunist persecution, which, besides its traditional aim of slander, also pursues the more concrete aims of intimidating all those who show willingness to cooperate with communists, of preventing an alliance with them, and of presenting joint actions as communist "intrigues" and as a manifestation of communist "perfidy and cupidity."

The communist movement has always oriented itself toward broadening contacts and cooperation with other democratic forces. V. I. Lenin warned as early as in his work "Left-Wing Communism, an Infantile Disorder" how important it is for communists "not to fear difficulties, not to fear fault-finding, insults and persecution on the part of the 'leaders...and definitely to WORK WHERE THE MASSES ARE.\*" The working class has reached a level in its historical

---

\* "Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 41, p 36).



development in which it expresses the interests common to all mankind more and more fully and unites the broadest strata of society in the struggle for social progress. The words of F. Engels that communism "is not only the cause of the workers, but of all mankind"\* are imbued with particular meaning in our time.

The international communist movement has approached the present stage of the social struggle with a great deal of experience behind it. The revolutionary parties of the working class are developing ever more extensive alliances. Thus, the French communists actively work in various social associations which deal with family problems and problems of public life, in sports organizations, parental committees, associations of apartment tenants and pensioners, cooperative societies, mutual aid societies and so forth, which have long existed in their country. The activities are now carried out on an unprecedented scale. Over the last decade the number of these organizations has almost doubled and reached a total of 500,000, encompassing up to 25 million participants. The French Communist Party attaches great significance to these organizations. They were discussed in detail at the 24th Party Congress in February of 1982, and after the congress the Central Committee of the French Communist Party adopted a resolution appealing to communists to participate more and more actively in their activities. The French Communist Party resolution declares "its readiness to expand relations with movements and organizations on the basis of mutual respect and recognition of the independence of each of them." The same policy is pursued by the communist parties of Greece, Denmark, Portugal, the FRG, and many other countries.

The alliance of democratic forces for which communists are striving would entail cooperation that is equal and free of prejudice among those who are struggling to fulfill general tasks or any single concrete task. It is precisely such an approach to democratic alliances that is expressed in the final document of the 1969 Conference of Communist and Worker Parties. "Communists," it states, "are advocates of the most democratic methods of preparing and implementing united actions with all progressive, patriotic and peace-loving forces both within a national framework and on a regional and world-wide scale. They will do their utmost to achieve greater mutual understanding between the numerous and varied anti-imperialist trends and movements, while taking their uniqueness into account in this respect and respecting their independence."

The stability and breadth of cooperation are determined in many respects by the degree of consistency with which preference is given--in mutual relations with one's partners in joint operations--to what unites the partners and, even more than that, to what separates them. In the struggle for peace, for example, the need is increasing for contacts even with those forces which in other matters are not in accordance with communists and even act against them. In the struggle for peace and social progress it would be shortsighted not to consider an ally even if he is a conditional one. The unity of democratic forces is not simply the sum of the component participants of joint actions, but something a lot more. The achieved unit and joint actions sometimes also exert a mobilizing influence upon those who still stand aloof.

---

\* K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch." [Works], vol 2, p 516.

However, willingness to come to agreements and make compromises has nothing in common with renouncing one's convictions or "loosening" those principles, the loyalty to which makes communists communists. Even today, Lenin's words are unfading: "No practical alliances...can or must lead to compromise or concessions in theory, program or standards."\*

In communist party documents ever greater attention is devoted to determining policy with regard to possible allies. It was noted at the Sixth Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of West Berlin in May 1981 that "We must never be afraid of making contacts...and we must never spare any effort for the sake of participating in the activities of various unions, supporting these unions, and advancing our own initiatives." The 25th Congress of the Communist Party of Canada in February 1982 committed the party to actively join in every socialist movement, to act while avoiding sectarian estrangement with regard to these movements, and to struggle "against any tendency of self-isolation."

The movements and the manifestations within them of anticommunism and of left-wing extremist and anarchistic trends were discussed at the Sixth Congress of the German Communist Party. Nevertheless, the congress emphasized: "We would not be communists if we shunned dialogue and cooperation with these forces..." Communists in the FRG have repeatedly expressed the understanding of the fact that many partners in joint operations in broad democratic movements have views different from their own and that disagreements and even conflicts can arise between them. However, communists do not regard this as grounds for renouncing the struggle for objectively common interests. "Whoever refuses to capitulate under the present difficult conditions," writes the West German Marxist R. Steigerwald, "but rather seeks a way out is our ally, even if we criticize him for what he considers to be the way out, although in actual fact it may only be an error."

Communists in Belgium hold a similar point of view. They consider in particular that the program of the peace movement cannot be identical to the Peace Program of the Communist Party, and that it would be a mistake to assume any maximalist positions without considering the nature of this powerful social movement. "Acting in this way," Jan Debrouwere, a member of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Belgian Communist Party, says in an article, "means dooming the party to isolation. Being convinced of one's own rightness is good, but one must be able to convince others of this, people with their own line of reasoning and their own arguments." The ability to "further develop the art of discussion," and to approach allies not with ready-made decisions, but with the appeal "Let us think it over together! We will try to see what we can agree on," and the erroneous nature of the idea "that those who are not 100 percent with us are 100 percent against us" were discussed at the 22th National Congress of the Communist Party of the USA. It was said with irony at this congress that if some communists are unable to work with those who do not agree with them in everything, then they "will not be able to work with anyone except themselves."

---

\* "Poln. Sobr. Soch.," vol 2, p 450.

Communists understand that the path to cooperation lies through discussions in a frank and unconstrained form of any questions troubling the participants of democratic movements. The joint struggle for peace and the vital interests of the working people does not tolerate sectarianism, and it would be wrong to think only one's own proposals deserving of attention. What is more, it is the essence of the proposals that is important and not who makes them, for the real result achieved in the struggle is what is of primary significance.

"We do not claim a monopoly on taking the initiative. At times we would even be glad if other democratic forces also were more active in taking initiatives aimed at safeguarding joint interests. We will always be ready to support and take up these initiatives," Herbert Mies stated in one of his speeches. Valuable initiatives, regardless of who makes them, provides a stimulus for joint struggle. The history of the liberation movement provides a considerable number of examples of communists deliberately keeping out of the foreground to avoid putting an unnecessary trump card into the hands of the organizers of anticommunist campaigns.

The methods and forms of implementing a policy of democratic alliances are most varied; they are not just agreements on the unity of actions, officially consolidated by the leadership of some party or other or some organization or other, but also unity of actions established "from below," agreements on joint actions, both daily and episodic cooperation, contacts on various grounds, and much, much more. Every stage of achieved unity requires its own approach and the necessary flexibility and ability to make the transition from simple forms of accord to more complex ones. As practice shows, elementary forms of cooperation with different detachments of contemporary social movements can open up broader future prospects.

Communists regard their primary task as being that of introducing organization, awareness and an understanding of historical perspective to the mass democratic movements. What can determine the position of the communist party in the democratic alliance? First of all, its own activeness, initiative, and consistency in defending those aims in the name of which the cooperation was formed. The vanguard role of the communists can be acknowledged only under the condition that they are really in the front ranks and that they show farsightedness and a principled attitude. For the ideas of scientific socialism to find a way to the masses, French communists have noted, one must learn to react quickly to current problems and to put forward new ideas. We must "explain," it was said at the 24th Congress of the French Communist Party, "what aims we are striving for and by what means we intend to achieve them, and we must do this simply, but not in a simplified way, frankly, but not harshly, while being able to put forward our own arguments but also to hear out others...."

The heterogeneity of the composition of the contemporary social movements means that there is an unusual diversity of the ideological views represented within them. Various ideological concepts, from anarchist, reformist, religious to pseudo-Marxist, are really oddly interwoven in them. Communists cannot keep silent where hostile views need to be rebuffed.



Consequently, it is particularly important to establish the correct correlation in the formula "alliance" and "ideological struggle." Under present-day conditions, the priority in the correlation "alliance" and "struggle" goes to striving for an "alliance." Regarding the new social movements one can say, for example: "A determined ideological struggle must be waged against their erroneous views, while making use of the opportunity for agreement or an alliance with them in this respect." Such views are encountered on pages of the communist press. But is it not more correct to turn around the premises of this conclusion? Then it would be as follows: "It is necessary to utilize all opportunities for agreements and alliance while waging a tireless struggle in this connection against erroneous views." It appears that this is a case when, despite a certain rule, the final result is changed through a transposition of the parts.

Moving the task of utilizing all opportunities for an alliance to the first place determines in many respects the very character and style of polemics. Polemics taken as a starting premise can engender doubts about the possibility of reaching agreement on practical questions. At one of the plenums of the Central Committee of the Austrian Communist Party, which discussed the question of attitude toward the contemporary social movements, it was justifiably stated: "We are not indifferent regarding the paths along which they will develop and become differentiated and whether they will turn into a movement of conscious anticapitalist protest or fall into an impasse of isolation or of integration in the state-monopolist system... It would be a gross political mistake if we avoided public discussions. At the same time, what is involved is a differentiated and businesslike criticism."

At the same time, the communists understand that the more intensive the contacts with nonproletarian strata are the greater the danger is of views alien to scientific socialism penetrating their ranks. It is for this reason that the struggle for the purity of Marxism-Leninism and its creative development, taking into account new phenomena in social and political life, is currently so important.

Rallying diverse movements around the workers class is a complex and contradictory process. The bourgeois and some reformist ideologists try to oppose the contemporary social movements to the working class. Some of them even attribute some kind of a historical liberation mission (as a counterweight to the working class) to these new movements and especially to the alternative movements. French sociologist Alain Touraine directly states that the alternative movements should replace the workers' movement. In his book "The Concept of 'Post-Socialism'" he invests them with a revolutionary force which the "politicized" workers class has allegedly lost. He proclaims these movements as promoters of some kind of a "new democracy" "free" from politics and political parties. "...Just as the workers movement was born in the last century not in parliaments but in industrial plants, at the present time priority must be given to action in the field before interference in the political sphere," A. Touraine writes. Essentially, A. Touraine is burying the workers' movement. Another well-known French ideologist, Andre Gorts, in his book pretentiously entitled "Farewell to the Proletariat," traces the advances to the "society of the future" not through the conquest of political



power by the working class but through removing the "sphere of social relations from the range of jurisdiction of the state authority and expanding this sphere in such a way that the authority will not be able to penetrate it." The author places all hopes of realizing his utopian idea on the contemporary social movements.

Of course, such "alternatives" are not in the least frightening for the bourgeoisie. But they are quite capable of sowing illusions and disuniting the participants of democratic struggle. Bearing in mind this kind of project of "restructuring" the contemporary capitalist society, J. M. Simon, one of the active officials of the Belgian Communist Party, has spoken ironically about their authors. According to them, he noted, it turns out that a "district committee that wages a struggle for a children's playground and courageously stands up to the local authorities, is also able to independently, quickly, and critically analyze the society as a whole and that such a committee represents an embryo of socialism."

The position of communists is to assist the struggle for the most consistent and complete fulfillment of those democratic tasks which are raised by the demands of the new social movements. For, as the 26th CPSU Congress notes, "the communists, armed with the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, perceive more deeply and more correctly than anyone else the essence and the prospects of the processes that are taking place in the world...."

Marxist-Leninist theory reveals the true ways and means of achieving not only the socialist but also the general democratic goals. The dissemination of the ideas of scientific socialism among the contemporary democratic social movements strengthens and intensifies them and shows them the precise guidelines for effective actions.

The universality of Marxist-Leninist theory presupposes a comprehensive analysis of other trends of democratic social thinking that reflect diverse processes of the economic, sociopolitical, and spiritual life of the working people, even though they reflect these processes in a one-sided and, at times, even in distorted forms. The universality of Marxism-Leninism specifically manifests itself in its profound theoretical mastering of the entire totality of historical experience of the contemporary period, including the experience of the struggle of various social trends appearing outside the framework of the workers' movement.

The views of the ideologists of the "new left" whose ranks have produced many participants of the contemporary alternative movements have been repeatedly and justifiably criticized by Marxists. At the same time, the works of some members of the "new left" have provided sufficiently sharp criticisms of specific traits of contemporary capitalism, its spiritual poverty and consumer ideology and psychology. Theoreticians of the petty bourgeois left radicalism have drawn the public's attention to the complex social-psychological and ideological mechanism that has been built by monopolist capital to foist artificial wants on the individual in order to gradually "integrate" him in the bourgeois system, and to the methods and means used to "unostentatiously" discredit the opposition trends. Of course, the left radical criticism of

"consumer capitalism" has been of a class-limited nature but it cannot be denied that it has touched on some "nerve knots" of the contemporary bourgeois society. A deeper and more comprehensive analysis of the "consumer capitalism" has been subsequently made from scientific positions by the communist movement.

In our time, the original experience of the new social movements provides the Marxists with considerable materials for theoretical research of the trends of the contemporary world revolutionary process and of its widening social base. Numerous antiwar movements in particular pose for the Marxists a number of problems connected with the elaboration of the struggle for peace. Or, let us consider the so-called neofeminist movements. They also demand of the Marxists a more thorough approach to understanding the problem of the woman's place and role in public life.

The appearance of new social movements on the scene of social struggle in the capitalist countries is a clear indicator of deepening contradictions of the capitalist system. Many of these movements do not see clearly yet in what direction they should move. But it is perfectly obvious that they cannot move along a road together with capitalism. Protest against many vices and the very foundations of the increasingly decrepit capitalist civilization is becoming ripe among various classes and social strata and in the views and awareness of people of different views and beliefs. High ideals and inspiring prospects do not tally with this civilization. Even those who only yesterday sided with it are turning away from it. This is yet further evidence of the fact that the future belongs to another social system, the rising communist civilization.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel' tvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

CSO: 1802/11

## DEPARTURES AND BLIND ALLEYS OF BOURGEOIS POLITICAL ECONOMY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84)  
pp 116-121

[Article by N. Yermoshkin]

[Text] A round table meeting of Bulgarian and Soviet scientists on the topic of criticism of bourgeois political economic theories was held on the initiative of NOVO VREME, the theoretical and political journal of the BCP Central Committee, in Sofia in November 1983. A representative of the journal KOMMUNIST participated in its proceedings. Following is a review of the main reports and presentations by the participants in the discussion.

In his opening address, Academician N. Iribadzhakov, NOVO VREME editor in chief, noted the tempestuous process of internationalization of international economic life, covering virtually the entire globe. Characteristically, the growth rates of international trade and capital exports are considerably outstripping production growth rates. Such an increase in economic relations conceals tremendous opportunities for improving the quality of life of the people throughout the planet. However, in the hands of contemporary imperialism, this process, which should work for the good of mankind, is turning into its opposite by contributing to the exploitation of the working class by international capitalism and to plundering the peoples of the young liberated countries by former and new colonizers. Imperialism is promoting an insane arms race which exclusively benefits the West's military-industrial complex and dooms millions of people in the capitalist world to hunger and poverty. Another consequence of the intensification of economic relations is the internationalization of the general crisis of capitalism and its increased negative influence precisely on the periphery of the global capitalist economy. The imperialists have succeeded in partially shifting to their weaker partners the burdens of the current economic crisis which has been disturbing the Western world for the past 3 years.

Meanwhile, the process of internationalization of economic life under socialism is speeding up progress and contributing to the rapprochement between the levels of development and improved prosperity of the peoples in the socialist countries and helping the former victims of colonial oppression to achieve higher growth rates. It is also helping to strengthen the defense capability

of the socialist countries under the conditions of the increased aggressiveness of world imperialism, headed by the United States.

In this connection, N. Iribadzhakov stressed, the task of the participants in the Bulgarian-Soviet encounter is to interpret the new phenomena in the capitalist economy and the characteristics of the current stage in the general crisis of the capitalist system, to identify the nature and essence of the activities of the gigantic multinational corporations, to expose the practical supporting role played by contemporary bourgeois political economy and to consider its main trends. The struggle between the two outlooks and research methodologies -- bourgeois and Marxist-Leninist -- urgently requires the thorough and close study of the theoretical baggage on which the policy and ideology of state-monopoly capitalism rest.

Academician A. G. Mileykovskiy (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of World Economics and International Relations) discussed in detail the main trends and directions in contemporary bourgeois political economy. In his view, a stock of theories, "models," methods, targets, instruments and so on, common to all industrially developed capitalist countries exists, forming a specific cosmopolitan "language" in economic theory. The individual theories are different from all the others, within the framework of the specific economic "language" only on the basis of national traditions, legislative features, the requirements of the moment and the creative imagination of its creators. The concepts developed by the Keynesians, dirigists, neoclassicists, authors of "models" of economic growth and supporters of institutionalized sociological schools or eclectic structures of elements belonging to different structures are the sources and components of the contemporary extremely flexible yet very pragmatic bourgeois economic theory.

Therefore, criticism of bourgeois political economy presumes not only the continuing study of general laws governing the development of this theory but a specific analysis of the means of its utilization for political purposes. Equally important is the analysis of its applied role in the global strategy of state-monopoly regulation of the world capitalist economy, the purpose of which is to ensure the expanded reproduction of bourgeois production relations on earth and to obstruct the development of the global revolutionary process.

The ideologues of contemporary imperialism are trying to depict the decline of capitalism and its general crisis as the dawn of a "postindustrial civilization," the "model" for which is allegedly already being designed in the highly developed Western countries on the basis of the scientific and technical revolution. The qualitative changes taking place in the scale and forms of the ideological struggle, A. G. Mileykovskiy notes, require a new approach to the study of the laws of development of bourgeois political economy. Today we can no longer speak of its "deideologization," for the confrontation between the two social systems and the struggle against the international working class and the national liberation movements have come to the forefront, limiting what is known in Western publications as "high" or "pure" economic theory -- "economics."

The priority of politics over "economics" was also clearly manifested in the research centers new to bourgeois economic sciences, the main task of which is to formulate the global strategy of imperialism.



A number of events which revealed the political and economic instability of capitalism and indicated the aggravation of its general crisis gave an impetus to the reorganization of bourgeois economic science. Their prologue was the defeat of American imperialism in Vietnam, which became apparent at the beginning of the 1970s, and the development of the unusual cyclical and structural economic crisis of 1974-1975. Unlike all previous crises, this one was characterized not by lowering commodity prices, which could allow capitalism to come out of the crisis through the gradual resorption of commodity stock-piles but, conversely, by a sharp price increase and a galloping inflation which is undermining the foundations of the entire capitalist credit system.

"As to the capitalist world," as was noted at the June 1983 CPSU Central Committee Plenum, "we are witnessing a significant aggravation of the general crisis of this social system. The methods with which capitalism was able to maintain a relatively stable development during the postwar period are becoming increasingly ineffective."

The depth of crisis processes in the capitalist economy is confirmed by the fact that the number of totally unemployed people in OECD countries increased from 27.4 million in 1982 to 32.1 million at the beginning of 1983. The share of unused production capacities reached a considerable scale and the real wages of the working people declined.

The militarization of the economy as a way out of the crisis proved to be the crowning "wisdom" of the imperialist strategists, developed by its most reactionary economists and politicians blinded by anticommunism.

The heart of the matter, A. G. Mileykovskiy emphasized, is that the new indications of decay, degradation and parasitism are manifested not only in the economy but also in the superstructure of capitalism. Crisis processes are intensified by the antipeople's policy of monopoly capital which is using modern political economy as an ideological cover for its onslaught against the economic and social positions of the working class.

Doctor of Economic Sciences V. S. Afanas'yev (CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences), reported on the methodological problems in the critique of contemporary bourgeois political economy. In his view, it is precisely the growing contradictions between the basic dogmas of bourgeois political economy and the real course of the contemporary sociohistorical process which led to the further intensification of the crisis in bourgeois economic theory during the 1970s and beginning of 1980s and which resulted in the bankruptcy of "neoclassical synthesis" and Neokeynsianism, which were oriented above all toward the formulation of practical recommendations for the economic policy of state-monopoly capitalism. The fact that these basic trends in contemporary bourgeois political economy were compromised inspired Western economic science to engage in a feverish search for a "new paradigm."

The promotion to the forefront of official economic doctrines of neoconservative theories as the basis of the reactionary economic policies of a number of bourgeois governments, those of the United States and Great Britain in particular, the energizing of monetarism and the elaboration of the "economic theory of offer," the "rational expectations" concept and comparative economic

systems and the energizing of "Sovietology" are aspects of the crisis reorganization of Western economic sciences and the search of means for ideological rearmament.

These shifts in the structure of contemporary bourgeois political economic theory do not indicate in the least that the bankrupt economic theories have been totally abandoned or that under specific socioeconomic and political conditions the bourgeois scientists would not return to one variety or another of "neoclassical synthesis," "Neokeynsianism" or other forms of bourgeois theories of state-monopoly control of the capitalist economy or one variation or another of the concept of the "transformation of capitalism."

The fact is that the objective foundation for such theories has not been eliminated in the least: This complex interweaving of two forms of economic mechanism, the unregulated-market and regulated state-monopoly aspects of the capitalist economy, the trend toward the further socialization of the capitalist economy and, in this connection, the growth of its internal contradictions, the progress of the world revolutionary process, etc., are typical of contemporary capitalism.

The same viewpoint was held by Bulgarian scientist A. Leonidov, who believes that today as well the capitalist world relies on two types of state economic policy: The neoconservative and the Postkeynsian, which frequently operate in a strangely combined fashion. Even today, in the face of the changes which have taken place in the system of state-monopoly control, in recent years the question of the importance of Keynesianism under contemporary conditions is legitimately raised in the United States, Great Britain and the FRG, which have become models of a turn to neoconservatism. The replacement of the Keynesian "full employment" concept with that of the "natural level of unemployment," which the monetarists share with M. Friedman, gives no reasons to believe that Keynesianism has lost its real significance in the theory and practice of state-monopoly regulation. Despite the curtailment of social programs in the United States, Great Britain and other capitalist countries, the system of social assistance, which was generally created in the 1930s, continues to operate. It is precisely on this system that the anticrisis and anticyclical impact of the steps taken by the bourgeois governments is based. The dismantling of this system is improbable, for even the most conservative forces realize that this would bring about extremely undesirable and dangerous social consequences to themselves. A. Leonidov drew attention to the need to distinguish in our analyses of the new trends which appear in the system of state-monopoly capitalism between slogans raised by the leaders of neoconservative trends and schools and the changes which actually take place. Unlike claims that it is a question of freeing economic life from the harmful role of the state, an actual rationalization of this role is apparent. The emphasis is on the creation of conditions offering greater scope to unregulated market forces and competition, but within the framework of state-monopoly structures monopoly structures of an irreversible nature.

The paper submitted by Professor T. Trendafilov (Bulgarian Institute of Contemporary Social Theories) dealt with conservative trends within contemporary bourgeois economy. The main reason for the resurrection of

conservative views in theory and economic practice is the crisis in state-monopoly control, capitalist programming and economic regulation.

The Keynesian system of ensuring effective demand and "full employment" on the basis of parity between investments and savings, supported by deficit budget financing of economic growth, collapsed. Inflation and unemployment have reached dimensions which make them threatening to the ruling classes themselves. It is precisely such a course of events, rather than some sort of theoretical accomplishment or renovation of "neoclassical" economic thinking, which increased the interest in conservative ideas and suggestions. In the opinion of the Bulgarian scientist the experiments conducted with the help of neoconservative economic policy have not led so far to a "neoclassical renaissance." In any case, no signs are apparent so far to indicate any kind of essential improvement of the crisis in which the developed capitalist society finds itself. The economic, political and ideological situation in the capitalist world is distinguished by the kind of symptoms of instability and overstress which seriously threaten the foundations of universal peace and the security of all nations.

The round-table participants paid particular attention to the need for a critical study of the theoretical postulates of Western economists and the broadening of their own studies of the so-called multinational corporations, behind which stand the most powerful and greedy monopolies engaged in production, financial and commercial activities in several countries simultaneously.

The very scope of their operations confirms the global nature of their influence. Presently the multinational corporations control approximately 40 percent of industrial output in the capitalist world, two thirds of its foreign trade and nearly 80 percent of the development and application of all new technology. In his book "The American Corporations," Yale University Professor R. J. Barber writes that they "are more powerful than the United Nations." The corporations belonging to American capital play the main role among these gigantic monopoly associations.

The inevitable consequence of the energizing of the multinational corporations in the economic activities of the capitalist world, which many participants in the discussion noted as a new phenomenon, was a drastic intensification of their role in shaping and implementing the foreign policies of the imperialist countries, their increased interference in the domestic affairs of sovereign states, with a view to creating a social climate favorable to themselves, urging on the arms race, which earns big business its highest profits, and its steady counteraction to the national liberation movement. This original strategy of total permissiveness is based on the idea of the "denationalization of the nation state" of the host country. The multinational corporations themselves are depicted as a force which "renovates" capitalism, the influence of which is comparable only to the consequences of the industrial revolution. It is claimed that it is precisely this "force" that can put an end to production anarchy and could make sensible use of nonrecoverable resources for the sake of the "progress and blossoming" of all nations. As Bulgarian economists D. Nikolov and P. Petkov accurately noted, this is the latest attempt at presenting the gigantically increased concentration of capital and production



within the framework of contemporary monopoly formations, the purpose of which is to change the social nature itself of contemporary capitalism. The most recent studies of multinational corporation activities provide sufficient proof that the basic laws of imperialism do not vanish. It is only the mechanism of their manifestation which changes, while the international monopolies in the form of multinational corporations and their social and class nature remain unchanged. The socioeconomic consequences of their activities are reduced to strengthening the omnipotence of monopoly capital, the intensification of its oppression and reaction along all lines.

The participants in the discussion pointed out not only the efforts made in recent years to develop a Western multinational strategy in terms of theory but also to increase the level of coordination of virtually all broad-scale expansionistic activities of the imperialist countries. The objective was to create a common front by international reaction against the peoples of the socialist and liberated countries.

The existence and consolidation of such interaction, A. G. Mileykovskiy pointed out, prove that the ruling Western circles are worried by the growth and strengthening of the positions of socialism and the energizing of the activities of the liberated countries. They realize the danger threatening imperialism and are doing everything possible to protect and broaden the positions of the imperialist monopolies, the multinational corporations above all, through joint efforts. The strengthening of the coordination mechanism of the policy of the imperialist states is an essential factor in contemporary international relations and world politics.

In the opinion of the participants in the round table discussion the domination of multinational corporations in the field of information and control over information flows (in the sense of full information, economic and commercial included) and, in this connection, the study of the so-called information sector in the capitalist economy, is of particular interest. Until recently, this interesting and important problem had been neglected by researchers. The attention which monopoly capital pays to this area is fully understandable, for today more than ever before communications play a tremendous role not only in ideology but in production, management, marketing and manpower distribution and in the social, military and, in the final account, political areas. Today 75 percent of all information systems and media in the capitalist world are controlled by a handful of multinational corporations. In terms of annual sales they are headed by IBM, General Electric, ITT and Westinghouse Electric (United States) and Phillips (The Netherlands).

In fulfilling the social instructions of imperialism, bourgeois political economy is formulating a variety of "models" of the future unified multinational society. Thus, the multinational corporation is proclaimed the primary cell of the future society, which will allegedly replace obsolete bourgeois political institutions. According to this view, the "democracy" of the stockholders' meeting is higher than that of traditional bourgeois democracy. In both theory and practice, the supporters of this type of approach to the multinational corporations demand that the corporations be given the same rights as the government. They demand "sovereign rights" which, in their view, would automatically substitute private for international law. The



foreign branches of such corporations, such theoreticians claim, should be granted diplomatic status and diplomatic immunity.

While such theoretical debates are going on, the governments of many Western countries, even large ones, not to mention the young liberated states, are faced with the refusal of cosmopolitan business, represented by multinational corporations and banks, to observe the local laws. Multinational corporations and banks are grossly violating them in their pursuit of maximal profits.

A large number of reports dealt with the attitude of bourgeois economic science toward the global problems of our time, above all the problems of preventing a global nuclear war, eliminating the backwardness of the young liberated states, protecting the human habitat and ensuring the availability of raw materials and energy. The speakers noted that despite all efforts to conceal their social order, the studies and "modelling" of bourgeois "globalists" have a clearly manifested class nature and that "futurology" itself is becoming one of the most important trends in the ideological confrontation between socialism and imperialism. Thus, hiding behind a truly necessary active and peaceful international cooperation for the sake of fruitfully resolving global problems, the old mythical idea of an inevitable "convergence" between capitalism and socialism is presented in a new wrapping in recent works by Western economists, as the allegedly only real way to rescue mankind from the danger which threatens it. It is claimed that American capitalism needs only insignificant "peripheral" corrections, whereas the socialist society urgently needs a "remodeling of its economic, political and value systems."

The supporters of this trend generously intersperse their works with abstract and allegedly class-"neutral" concepts, such as "world solidarity," "planetary consciousness," "economic society," "global plan," "new global community," "global model," "world crises," "dispersal of property," "rich-poor," "harmony of interests," "new humanism" and "universal parliament." They present the intensification of the general crisis of capitalism as a "crisis of mankind." This postulate led to the appearance of the original theory of "convergence of difficulties" which, unlike the initial convergence "substantiation," promotes the idea of the "rapprochement" between the two systems not on the basis of positive development factors but of surmounting allegedly common difficulties. The bourgeois ideologues are particularly zealous in substantiating the thesis according to which global problems should push class problems aside. In other words, they are preaching the abandonment of the class struggle for the sake of the "preservation of mankind."

The participants in the round table discussion noted another interesting detail: The term "convergence" is being deleted from the "futurological" and "globalist" reports issued by the Club of Rome, whereas the idea of a politically and ideologically "converging" evolution" is imbuing literally all views expressed by the authors of such works.

In the view of Dr of Economic Sciences I. Kotsev (Bulgarian Institute of Contemporary Social Theories), this is the latest attempt to introduce a certain vivifying stream into the orthodox theory of "convergence" by enriching it with the concepts of "reciprocal adaptation" and "synthesis"

between the two systems, while postponing their merger for a more distant future. A "hybrid" society is being promoted which, in the opinion of the supporters of the bourgeoisie, would "free" the working people from revolutionary ideology and class struggle ("deproletarianization of the workers") and would help to preserve the rule of capitalism with the help of insignificant changes ("the managerial revolution"). Trapped as they are by the traditional theoretical and methodological faults of bourgeois social science, its class limitations and apologetics, the Western "globalists" (economists, ecologists, sociologists, demographers, etc.) are impeding their own way to a more realistic assessment of the present and future world.

Candidate of Economic Sciences O. Teneva (NOVO VREME) discussed in detail the theory currently fashionable in the West of supply-side economics, which was the theoretical platform of the Republicans and of Reagan during the last electoral campaign. Reagan pitted it against the economic theory and policy based on the demand factor.

Chicago University's A. Laffer is one of the founders of this concept. Ten years ago, using the notorious "curve" he had plotted, he tried graphically to convince bourgeois theoreticians and ruling circles that increased state revenue and economic growth in general are not only not directly related to higher taxation but that, conversely, greater taxation has a destabilizing effect, for which reason he called for its substantial reduction. The theoretical and methodological base of his "curve" rested on that same neoclassical bourgeois political economy school which elevates the market mechanism to a fetish. In this case the role of the state is reduced merely to creating favorable conditions for "free enterprise."

Reliance on the new concept and shifting the emphasis from demand to supply entailed a complete change of initial theoretical postulates: Keynesian postulates were replaced by neoclassical ones. In an interview granted to the magazine DER SPIEGEL (No 30, 1982), J. Galbraith, the noted American theoretician, said in this connection that "Reagan was elected with the help of the U.S. rich. What these people want most of all is to pay as little tax as possible. The policy of supply is a screen behind which more money can imperceptibly go to the rich... In contemporary 20th century society, however, the desire to do something for the rich must be suitably presented. The rich must be helped not for their own sake but for the sake of benefiting the economy and putting the idle to work. The gift to the rich which the winner of the elections made was concealed behind the fig leaf of incentive for action."

O. Teneva believes that the theory of supply-side economics has been given a strong psychological twist, for it is based on subjective methods and incentives which govern the behavior of individuals and companies. J. Jilder, one of the most fierce proponents of this theory, openly wrote that "The most valuable capital of the American economy is faith and imagination. So far the intervention of the state has had a paralyzing effect on psychological production methods -- man's morale and inspiration in economics. The attitude toward the rich is a reliable indicator of the health of the capitalist economy, for it feeds from the dish of the capitalist. Increasing the income of the poor depends above all on the accumulation of wealth and consumption by

the rich. Taxing the rich more means weakening the investment process, something which, added to giving to the poor, means lowering their urge to work. Raising the income of the poor through of variety of aids can only destroy the psychological tie between labor effort and result."

Briefly stated, the rich invest insufficiently because they get little in return, while the poor work little because they get too much. Such is the frankly class nature of the demagoguery displayed by the supporters of this concept. With the help of its prescriptions the 40th President of the United States has tried, in accordance with the demands of traditional conservatives, to achieve economic growth, facilitate the life of big business and balance the federal budget with inflated military expenditures. Practical experience has shown that these are incompatible objectives and that any one of them can be attained only at the expense of the others.

The sad "records" (huge budget deficit, high unemployment, etc.) which were set as a result of the 3-year application of Reagan's economic program, O. Teneva pointed out, raise a question as to the effectiveness of his policy based on a "fashionable" economic concept.

Dr of Economic Sciences N. Bekhar, a Bulgarian researcher, reviewed in detail the situation with contemporary bourgeois "comparativistics." This trend in bourgeois economic science appeared toward the end of the 1930s as an expression of the faster adaptation of bourgeois political economy to the new ratio of forces in the international arena and the requirements of the class struggle. Bourgeois science was forced to adopt new ideas which could serve the interests of monopoly capital better without, however, changing the overall qualitative features of the theory it held. For whereas the "advantages" of the capitalist system had been previously considered unquestionable, now the bourgeois economists felt obligated to substantiate the "superiority" of their system with the help of new economic elaborations and a new conceptual apparatus.

In presenting this trend as a "synthesized nucleus" of the science of economics, "comparativistics" borrows from the various schools and trends whatever suits it and rejects theoretical concepts which are inconsistent with its relative structures at a given time. A typical example of this fact is its refusal to idealize the "free market economy," the "favorite child" of the bourgeois political economy of the neoliberal variety, and its acceptance of a "mixed type" economy as the "most preferable" and "realistic" economic system. The tendency to adapt to changing circumstances in the world with the help of already familiar concepts of bourgeois political economy is what determines the emphatically eclectic nature of "comparativistics."

With the help of a "comparative search for advantages" the bourgeois theoreticians would like not only to discredit socialism but also to formulate practical recommendations relative to the strategy applied by the monopoly bourgeoisie and the ruling circles of Western countries in the international arena. The specific objectives of the comparative systems analysis are also determined by the important "social instruction" of identifying the strong and "weak" points of the socialist economy so that the monopoly bourgeoisie could assume a dual stand toward real socialism. On the one hand, it looks for the

necessary economic contacts and marketing possibilities of the socialist market. On the other, it mounts the struggle against socialism, in both theory and practice, along all lines.

Another purpose of contemporary bourgeois "comparativistics" is related to its practical and ideological functions. According to a number of authors it must serve as the conceptual base for the formulation of a differentiated policy of the capitalist states toward the individual socialist countries.

In summing up the debates, N. Iribadzhakov noted that the round table debaters considered a broad range of problems related to the contemporary condition of the global capitalist economy and Western political economy the purpose of which is to serve it. Unfortunately, the topic of criticizing the bourgeois "models" of development of the young liberated countries and their excessively increased indebtedness was not discussed, and nor was the question of the way shameless cynical wealth and property are converted into political power, strangely linked through thousands of visible and invisible threads within contemporary bourgeois society. Nor were problems of interimperialist rivalry covered sufficiently.

As a whole, however, the interesting discussion, which took place in an informal comradely atmosphere, proved the inexhaustible possibilities which exist in exposing the parasitical and exploitative nature of contemporary imperialism and which reside in a specific and knowledgeable criticism of bourgeois political economy. This offers a broad scope for topical analytical works by interested Marxist researchers and a great deal remains to be done in this area.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSSS "Pravda." "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11



## WORKPLACE SYSTEM: DEVELOPMENT FEATURES

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 23 Mar 84)  
pp 122-125

[Letter to the editors by Candidate of Technical Sciences I. Malmygin, senior scientific associate, USSR Gosplan NIEI [Scientific Research Institute of Economics]]

[Text] So far the task of ensuring the balanced development of labor tools and manpower was accomplished through the indicator of the worker's capital-labor ratio. One of the features of this indicator is that if the shift coefficient is not equal to one it indicates a conventional computed amount of assets. For example, if a workplace consists of six machine tools and the operator services all of them within the same shift, the computed capital-labor ratio will indicate three machine tools per person in two-shift work and two machine tools per person in three-shift work. This feature of the indicator of a computed capital-labor ratio is "ignored" in planning the development of basic productive capital and capacities. Thus, for instance, a lowering of the shift coefficient in enterprise work in past five-year plans has led to an apparent increase in the capital-labor ratio. In planning from the "base" and extending the negative trends of the base to the planned period, the economists increase the needed quantity of productive capital and amount of capital investments, thus creating workplaces which remain vacant as a result of the scarcity of workers although, in fact, they are unnecessary.

The features of a workplace must be such as to meet both the requirements stemming from the object -- the product of labor -- as well as from the person who occupies that workplace. In turn, however, the workplace has requirements concerning the worker, in terms of his profession, skill, sex, age, culture, thrift, etc.

Currently, in designing enterprises (the construction part) and their equipment (the technological part) and in the certification of the workers, the jobs and the output, all of these requirements and the features of all production factors and conditions are considered on a separate and isolated basis, at different times and by different specialists. This leads to contradictions which reduce production efficiency and quality and diminish the person's satisfaction from his work.

According to this author's computations, the surplus of workplaces in the USSR in 1982 for the first shift was 11 percent in industry, 9 percent in agriculture and 16 percent in construction. The sum total of unused productive capital (allegedly for lack of manpower) amounted to some 80 billion rubles in industry. With a 5 percent increase in the demand for workers compared to the norm, the equipment shift coefficient is reduced by 17 percent, the serviced area by 19 percent, labor intensiveness by 20 percent and the time spent working at the same workplace by a factor of 4-5. Meanwhile equipment idling doubles and remuneration increases by 38 percent. The number of workplaces per 1 million rubles' worth of goods produced annually between 1965 and 1975 declined in industry from 72 to 51 and has remained virtually stable since 1980. Costs per workplace increased from 10,200 rubles in 1965 to 18,600 in 1980, i.e. a steady increase of 550 rubles per year. The most important reason for diminishing capital returns has been the lowered workplace shift coefficient caused by an increasing workplace surplus.

That is why the time has come to convert in plan computations from a conventional capital-labor ratio to the real, an actual one. However, this indicator is nothing, but the amount of basic productive capital in physical or value terms, which constitutes the workplace held by one worker.

The "individual workplace" technical and economic category is characterized by features such as the number of workplaces, their shift coefficient, the size of their staff, share of capital investments per workplace, its planned and actual cost, output per workplace per unit of time, number of workplaces per unit enterprise capacity or per 1 million rubles of output per year and production area and number of equipment units (tools, machines, mechanisms, etc.) per workplace. The use of such indicators in planning analysis enables us to save on capital investments and creates prerequisites for improving the efficiency with which labor means and objects and manpower are used.

The balancing of workplaces with manpower must be kept separate in terms of quantity and quality. A quantitative balance means equality between the number of workplaces times the established coefficient for filling workplace vacancies and the number of workers. The qualitative balance is the consistency between the professions and skills of the workers and the technological purpose and technical standards of equipment installed in workplaces.

Unfortunately, the consistency between the features of the individual workplace and the individual worker who occupies it is far from completely secured. In actual terms, the profession, skills, sex, age, character, state of health and other features of the worker do not entirely match the demands based on the features of the workplace. Nor is there full consistency between the socially necessary actual number of workplaces in the national economy and in its individual areas. Finally, outlays for the creation and use of workplaces are not fully consistent with their returns.

The use in planning and accounting of the indicator which characterizes the number of workplaces by the Gosplan, State Committee for Labor, Central Statistical Administration, State Committee for Science and Technology and the USSR Gosstandart is of great importance in balancing the newly created workplaces with manpower. The plans call for improving the existing and

creating new labor tools in the national economy balanced with available manpower, starting with 1984. It is a question of creating the type of conditions which will ensure effective development ratios between the amount, technological purpose and quality of workplaces and the amount, profession and skills of the workers.

Selective studies of enterprises with a view to determining the balancing of workplaces and manpower resources have been conducted by scientific research organizations and some ministries since 1976. The results depend on the way the problem was formulated, the way this affects the reputation of the enterprise and the type of features encouraged in this connection. For example, if a shortage of workers needed to handle idling equipment is determined, the enterprises would show in their reports a 25-27 percent surplus workplaces in the hope of obtaining additional workers. If the enterprises are forced to indicate the share of idling equipment, usually it would average 2-3 and rarely 5-6 percent, for otherwise they would receive no capital investments for expansion or new construction. That is why in the study of the enterprises it is very important to develop the method itself, for practical experience proves that the method could affect results by several hundred percent. Nevertheless, the qualitative aspect has always remained the same: The enterprises have an imbalance between labor tools and workers.

According to our computations, currently the surplus in the actual number of workplaces compared to the size of labor resources and the shift coefficient based on enterprise capacities is in the range of dozens of percentage figures and outlays for the creation and repair of productive capital for such workplaces range in the billions of rubles. The existence of unmanned workplaces hinders the growth of labor productivity. The national income could increase by maintaining the balance between workplaces and labor resources.

The study of the economic mechanism indicates that many enterprises and departments are interested in maintaining such imbalance. Actually the salaries of employees increase with the number of workers and a higher volume of output. The number of workers and employees is based on the planned volumes of production of goods and services. In turn, these volumes depend on the enterprise's capacity. The enterprise's capacity is computed on the basis of equipment data (quantity, productivity and number of shifts), i.e., on the basis of the number of workplaces, output per workplace and the shift coefficient. By opening new workplaces and increasing their capacity, staff and volume of output, the enterprises move into a higher wage category. The peculiarity of this process lies in the steady surplus of workplaces compared to the size of the staff and the steadily unsatisfied need for workers.

The availability of extensive reserves offers the heads of enterprises, associations and ministries an advantage in shifting orders from one enterprise to another, converting from one type of production to another and surmounting "peak" production loads. Furthermore, they do not have to concern themselves with the efficient utilization of productive capital and production areas.

The construction organizations are more willing to undertake new construction and expansion of existing enterprises rather than their technical retooling and reconstruction for which they earn less.

Capital investments for creating new workplaces are allocated to ministries and departments on a centralized basis, regardless of the results of economic activities and the use made of existing workplaces. This is liable to create in the consumers a dependent attitude toward the state and a negligent attitude toward capital investments and productive capital.

The contemporary designer shows little concern for manpower savings but greater concern for saving on capital investments. The aspiration to lower construction cost and capital recovery estimates frequently leads to selecting less expensive technological systems and a respectively "less expensive" equipment. As a rule, however, such equipment requires higher labor outlays. In order to interest the designer in increasing the number of multiple-machine handling personnel and the combination of skills (i.e., reducing the number of workplaces and workers) it is necessary to encourage the type of design and principles governing the location of machine tools in the shop which would make the work of multiple-machine operators easier. Such operators will not be isolated cases as they are now but will extend to the majority of workers. The same approach should apply to conventional and programmed machine tools and robots.

Of late the economic efficiency of replacing labor with materials and manual labor with machines has become a very relevant topic. In our view the problem should be formulated differently from the way it is in theory: Not reducing the size of the staff by increasing the value of productive capital but reducing both staff and productive capital. How to achieve this?

According to the computations made by this author, between 1965 and 1980 the number of workplaces in industry per million rubles of gross output per year declined from 72 to 48. However, it has remained virtually unchanged since 1980. In other words, output per workplace stopped increasing. However, the cost per workplace for the same period, as we saw, increased substantially and will reach 23,200 rubles by 1985. The economic efficiency of the workplace is declining, not only as a result of the reduced shift coefficient and the increased amount of unused equipment but also of the worsened intrashift utilization of equipment, signifying a decline in labor intensiveness and increased intrashift idling. Unless these processes are stopped it would be hardly possible to expect increased capital returns during the 12th Five-Year Plan. In other national economic sectors the surplus of workplaces has been increasing with every passing year as a result of the equalization of supply and demand processes, while their utilization efficiency has been declining.

A number of draft sectorial capital investment plans for 1981-1985 were analyzed with a view to testing the methods we developed for planning the reproduction of workplaces; the balancing of the number of workplaces and the ceilings for the number of workers and employees determined by the ministries for the 11th Five-year Plan by individual year was determined with a view to substantiating the ceilings and structures of capital investments. Since a similar situation has developed in all sectors, let us review it by taking one of them as an example.

First and foremost, attention was paid to the low shift coefficient. If we agree with the ministry on the subject of the amount of requested capital



investments and their reproduction and technological structure, by the end of the 11th Five-Year Plan the shift coefficient should decline even further, specific capital investments would increase and capital returns would drop by 18-20 percent.

Taking into consideration the increased shift coefficient and reduced share of unused equipment, the number of workplaces needed by the ministry according to the approved ceilings for the number of employed workers and employees should be reduced from 303,000 to 242,000 for the five-year plan. According to the ministry's estimates, by the end of the five-year plan almost 135,000 workplaces would remain vacant.

The recommendation was made to change the production structure of capital investments: to lower the amount of funds used for expansion and new construction and to increase allocations for technical retooling and reconstruction.

This new kind of investment policy substantially changes the efficiency indicator. Thus, the annual output per workplace will increase from 14,890 rubles to 17,760 rubles during the 11th Five-Year Plan and reach 34,670 rubles during the 12th. A real possibility appeared to improve all other production efficiency indicators as well: the time needed for mastery and recovery of capital investments, labor productivity, profits, profitability and capital returns.

In order to interest workers and employees in working a second and third shift (i.e., in order to increase the shift coefficient of workplaces and the efficiency of capital investments and productive capital), it would be expedient, as was done in Czechoslovakia, to reduce the work week (but not the wages) of those who work in two or three shifts and to extend their annual paid leave. Bonuses based on the level of productive capital productivity or capital returns should be paid for holding capital-intensive jobs and for work involving scarce and one-of-a-kind equipment.

State capital investments should no longer be allocated to ministries with surplus workplaces for expanding, operating and building new enterprises. Should said ministries borrow funds from the bank for that purpose, the interest rate should be the higher the lower the coefficient of manning the workplaces becomes, and beyond a certain limit no loans should be extended. This kind of blocking mechanism should apply also in the use of the production development fund. The bank will not allow the enterprise to draw on its (bank) account if it makes unsatisfactory use of available workplaces while planning the creation of new ones.

Presently the effectiveness of the quantitative and qualitative balancing of workplaces with manpower resources can be evaluated roughly as follows: At the planning stage the use of the workplace and manpower balance helps us to avoid the creation of surplus workplaces and to save on capital investments. The amount of such savings is determined by the solutions contemplated in the plan, which could vary. When the workplaces become operational, the balance between them and manpower resources is manifested in several forms. The elimination of increased demand for workers turns into reduced cadre turnover,

improved average skills and increased labor productivity. Production discipline is strengthened and the quality of goods and services improves. The areas serviced by the workers expand and reach their normative level, which also leads to higher labor productivity. Balancing workplaces with manpower in construction reduces the work area to the optimal number of simultaneously constructed projects, shortens construction time and accelerates the renovation of enterprises in all national economic sectors.

In industry and construction today the workers change jobs on an average of every 2.5-3 years. The duration of their stay in one job is determined by the degree of job creativity. It is the shortest in manual and heavy work. The workers leave behind obsolete tools and other machines and move on to new modern facilities. Even the higher wages offered for such deserted workplaces fail to attract a sufficient number of workers. Briefly, the working person shows a negative attitude toward productive capital which impedes his progress as a creative individual. Should labor tools change as a result of improvements or production automation, the economic and social efficiency of the liberated labor in the socialist society increases, social homogeneity grows and labor becomes the prime vital need of the person. Whenever mechanized and automated equipment allows the workers to combine creative and mental activities with light physical labor they manifest more frequently their desire to promote the improvement of productive capital through rationalizations and inventions. A chain reaction develops: More advanced tools and machines contribute to creative work and the creatively working person acquires a better opportunity for and need to improve these same tools and machines, as a result of which the advancement of the "man-machine-environment" system is accelerated even further.

Let us point out that in discussing the "problem of labor resources" some authors emphasize the "difficult demographic situation" and the "manpower shortage" on the scale of our entire production process. Such a methodological approach to the problem requires a clarification.

The bourgeois economists who speak and write about manpower surplus or scarcity make their position clear. From the viewpoint of the enterprise owner, the purpose of the production process is profit. Hence it is "logical" to consider production capacities as the primary and the worker as the secondary element and to speak of manpower surplus and scarcity in terms of the base: production capacity.

In a socialist economy the production process serves man, for which reason the development of production capacities must be balanced with the size of the active population. If the entire active population is employed there neither is nor could there be any quantitative manpower problem. The problem may be territorial, sectorial or structural but not quantitative in terms of the national economy as a whole.

In my view, the attitude toward this problem, according to which the size of the active population must become the base in determining the rational number of workplaces is the most accurate and correct. Increasing the number of workplaces more than the size of the active population is not a necessary prerequisite for socialist production.

The "manpower shortage," i.e., the need for a specific size of active population in the country, is caused not by the demographic situation but by the imperfection of the economic mechanism used, including the development of production capacities -- workplaces -- insufficiently balanced with the development of labor resources.

Our country must engage in extensive and difficult work to attain a harmony between the working person and labor tools. This makes the use of obsolete methods, inertia and incompetence even more intolerable in such a most crucial state project. We must as of now envisage the solution of the most topical problems and, above all, draft a program of economic and organizational measures which will ensure the balancing of workplaces with manpower resources in the USSR.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda." "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## U.S. INTELLIGENTSIA: HISTORY AND CONTEMPORANEITY

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84)  
pp 126-127

[Review by N. Pokrovskiy of the book "Amerikanskiy Kapitalizm i Intelligentsiya" [American Capitalism and the Intelligentsia] by V. B. Kuvaldin. Nauka, Moscow, 1983, 366 pp]

[Text] The headlong expansion of the very large "area" of dependent, artfully manipulated and cruelly exploited intellectual labor in the capitalist countries, the United States above all, is having a great impact on the deployment of social forces and the development of the class struggle in these countries, coloring the spiritual situation in somber crisis hues. The transformation of the overwhelming mass of "white collar workers" and members of the liberal professions into hired labor, something quite obvious to the outside observers and to those personally involved, and the conversion of their work into an object of open, legalized and rapidly increasing exploitation, are creating in the minds of the contemporary Western intelligentsia a changed set of sociopsychological orientations which, most importantly, are bringing them closer to the other categories of working people.

The intelligentsia -- a stratum of professionals engaged in skilled mental labor -- is becoming a sensitive "meter" which registers the complex processes of social life, "predicting" the appearance of important generally significant sociopsychological phenomena, the time for the full appearance and development of which has not yet arrived"...The intelligentsia is described as such," V. I. Lenin wrote, "precisely because it reflects and expresses most conscientiously, decisively and accurately the development of class interests and political groups in the entire society" ("Poln. Sobr. Soch." [Complete Collected Works], vol 7, p 343). The intelligentsia's sociopsychological receptiveness to all types of currents and trends which go deep within the social structures cannot, however, be a guarantee for the precise and specific class orientation of this population stratum. In this sense the current situation of the American intelligentsia on the labor market and in political clashes could be the subject of serious considerations and conclusions, which is, actually, the topic of the book under review.

The basic scientific study made by V. B. Kuvaldin is centered on the historical fate of the American intelligentsia and the characteristics of its sociopolitical aspect in the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s. The author



repeatedly emphasizes that the development of the social consciousness of the American intelligentsia is taking place in an atmosphere of sharp ideological and political struggle between two class forces both of which try to draw to themselves the members of this influential social group. On the one hand, the important sociopolitical process of turning the intelligentsia into "the type of proletariat performing mental work, which is called upon to play a significant role in... the revolution...shoulder to shoulder with its brother-workers" (K. Marx and F. Engels, "Soch" [Works], vol 22, p 432) is being manifested in the United States. On the other, by virtue of certain sociohistorical factors, despite its rapprochement with the exploited toiling strata, and to a greater degree than the intelligentsia in many Western European countries, the American intelligentsia is buffeted by the elements of petit bourgeois moods and the influence of the bourgeois establishment.

In explaining the features governing shaping the intelligentsia in the United States, the author points out that in that country the development of individuals engaged in intellectual labor as a relatively separate population stratum with a specific range of social interests and objectives developed rather slowly. "Until the final decades of the 19th century demand for intellectual labor remained quite limited and the slim cultural stratum was dissolved within the petit bourgeois element" (p 353). It was actually this that created, and still does, durable feeling of anti-intellectualism which characterize the U.S. "ruling elite."

The ideology of big business penetrate deep within the national consciousness, poisoning it and becoming crystallized in a stable precipitate of "populist" prejudices which reduce culture and intellectual labor to the level of meaningless "egghead" entertainment. This phenomenon, which is of historical significance to the fate of the American intelligentsia, may be explained, among others, by the fact that the U.S. capitalist economy, which had a tempestuous development by the turn of the century, entailed a decisive destruction of foundations and a transformation in the production process and all social life. To a certain extent this disturbed the continuity of social experience in the broad meaning of the term, passed on from one generation of scientific-technical and humanitarian intelligentsia to another. (It is a peculiar paradox in history that the philosophy of pragmatism, a strictly American "invention," which provides the theoretical substantiation for the mobility, speed and dynamism of bourgeois social "experience" and the "relativity" of its spiritual values, also contains a nostalgic concern for the loss of intellectual ties between generations, which according to John Dewey, can be surmounted only with the system of the "new" education and upbringing.)

The development of the scientific and technical revolution under American capitalist conditions left a deep mark on the numerical strength of the intelligentsia in the United States and the structure of its social awareness. "The transformation of individuals engaged in intellectual labor into a mass stratum," the author writes, "changed the process of shaping the social awareness of the intelligentsia.... Let us note in this connection that during the 1970s and beginning of the 1980s the world of intellectual labor experienced the adverse consequences of capitalist rationalization under the conditions of a conversion to the intensive phase of the scientific and

technical revolution" (p 354). With some reservations, it is possible to claim that during that crucial period the material prerequisites for the crisis in capitalism grew faster than the spiritual ones. This particularly applies to a significant part of the American intelligentsia which fell under the power of the various neoconservative sociophilosophical and political trends which replaced the antibourgeois criticism of the beginning of the 1970s. The active development of a market for false material and spiritual needs, which affected the intelligentsia as well and are an indication of the crisis in capitalism, has as its purpose to "drown" the "accursed problems" of self-awareness in the intelligentsia in a sea of mass consumption and excessive consumerism.

Naturally, the American intelligentsia cannot be taken as an ideologically and socially homogenous group. After World War II it experienced processes of social differentiation. The intensified role of mystical and conservative views was paralleled by an increase in the role of democratic strata which actively participate in nationwide mass protest movements. The growing discontent with political monopoly in domestic and foreign policy is contributing to the fact that members of the progressive intelligentsia are becoming directly involved in the antimonopoly movement. The influence of Marxism has increased, above all among the academic intelligentsia and the social groups, such as university students, who gravitate toward it.

"The alliance between leftist and centrist forces based on a clear principled foundation," the author writes, "has been called upon to become the political expression of the antimonopoly coalition" (p 352). The American communists are perfectly aware of the full importance of the search for ways to forge an alliance between the progressive intelligentsia and the working class. At the same time, as the level of education and political self-awareness of the proletariat and its role increase, it becomes an influential intellectual force. This creates a basis for the development of an intellectual of a new kind, closely related to the tasks and objectives of the general proletarian struggle. This has been frequently pointed out in the documents of the U.S. Communist Party and the speeches of its leaders.

V. B. Kuvaldin's book covers a broad range of questions related to the various aspects of the historical, social, sociopsychological and political role of the U.S. intelligentsia. On the basis of Marxist scientific methodology, the author has tried to provide an integral picture of the situation of the contemporary American intelligentsia in a world of tempestuous social conflicts. And although, while developing in detail some topics (such as the problem of intellectual work under the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and the interrelationship between the intelligentsia and the working class) while only briefly mentioning others, he has succeeded in his attempt. In our view, the merit of this work lies also in the fact that the general conclusions it contains are organically expanded and confirmed by the study of historical and sociological data related to American reality.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

## STUDENT ENROLLMENT IN REPUBLIC AND INTEROBLAST HIGHER PARTY SCHOOLS

Moscow KOMMUNIST in Russian No 5, Mar 84 (signed to press 21 Mar 84) p 128

[Text] The regular enrollment of students in republic and interoblast higher party schools is hereby announced. Enrollment will be based on recommendations of the central committees of communist parties of union republics and party kraykoms and obkoms.

The higher party schools will accept CPSU members -- party, soviet, Komsomol and ideological workers -- with no less than 3-year party membership:

The 2-year departments and 3-year correspondence departments will accept candidates with a higher education degree not older than 40 years of age;

The 4-year departments and 5-year correspondence departments will accept candidates with a secondary education degree not older than 35 years of age.

By no later than 1 May 1984 the central committees of communist parties of union republics and the party kraykoms and obkoms must submit to the higher party schools excerpts of bureau decrees, recommendations and required documents for those recommended for such training.

Between 20 May and 10 June 1984 those recommended for training in 2-year departments and 3-year correspondence departments will be invited for a talk at the VPSH [Higher Party School]; candidates for the 4-year departments and 5-year correspondence departments will present themselves for taking the entrance examinations on foundations of Marxism-Leninism, Russian language (composition) and USSR history (secondary school level).

The recommended applicants will be granted a 2-week paid leave for studies and taking the examinations.

Classes in the higher party schools will begin on 1 September.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Kommunist", 1984

5003

CSO: 1802/11

END

**END OF**

**FICHE**

**DATE FILMED**

25 JUNE 1984